



**Columbia University**  
**in the City of New York**

THE LIBRARIES



Bequest of  
Frederic Bancroft  
1860-1945











Wm M. S. Taylor

1875  
1876  
1877  
1878  
1879  
1880  
1881  
1882  
1883  
1884  
1885  
1886  
1887  
1888  
1889  
1890  
1891  
1892  
1893  
1894  
1895  
1896  
1897  
1898  
1899  
1900

# AN APPEAL

IN BEHALF OF THE

VIEWS OF THE ETERNAL WORLD AND STATE,

AND THE

DOCTRINES OF FAITH AND LIFE,

HELD BY THE BODY OF CHRISTIANS WHO BELIEVE THAT A

## NEW CHURCH

IS SIGNIFIED (IN THE REVELATION, CHAP. XXI.) BY

## THE NEW JERUSALEM:

INCLUDING

ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS,

PARTICULARLY

THOSE OF THE REV. G. BEAUMONT, IN HIS WORK

ENTITLED

“THE ANTI-SWEDENBORG.”

ADDRESSED TO THE REFLECTING OF ALL DENOMINATIONS.

BY SAMUEL NOBLE,

MINISTER OF HANOVER STREET CHAPEL, LONDON.

For we have not followed cunningly devised fables. 2 Peter i. 16.

Beware therefore lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets: Behold, ye despisers; and wonder, and perish; for I work a work in your days, a work which ye shall in no wise believe, though a man declare it unto you.

Acts xiii. 40, 41; Hab. i. 5.



BOSTON,

PUBLISHED BY ADONIS HOWARD, SCHOOL STREET.

1830.

3220/1

938.94  
N668

---

BOSTON CLASSIC PRESS.....I. R. BUTTS.

---

345390

## P R E F A C E.

---

THE occasion and design of the following work are sufficiently explained in the Introductory Section; it is therefore unnecessary to say anything on those subjects here. But as the Author has arranged his materials in a form somewhat unusual, and differing from that which he would himself have deemed most eligible, some explanation of this circumstance may not be improper.

It was the wish of the Author that the work should contain a satisfactory elucidation of all the subjects discussed, and yet that it should be kept within a moderate compass and price. To accomplish the former object, as the views to be presented are so new to the world in general, it was necessary to conduct the investigations upon a rather extensive scale: to make, therefore, this compatible with the latter object, it was determined to introduce into *the text*, only such parts of the discussion as appeared most indispensable, and to throw all the subordinate and collateral inquiries and elucidations into the form of *notes*. And as it was found, towards the latter part of the work, that even under this arrangement the size of the volume was extending much beyond what was deemed eligible, it was thought advisable to dispose of the remaining articles of this kind in an *Appendix*, in which a much smaller type might be employed without injuring the appearance of the book. It would perhaps have been better if this plan had been adopted in the beginning, and all the long notes had been given in an Appendix; but the reason why the Author preferred to give the discussions thus introduced in the shape of notes, was, because he thought that they would, in that form, be more likely to be read; and he considers some of them to be equally necessary to his argument with what is offered in the text itself.

It has been endeavored, as far as possible, so to construct the notes, as that they may form one series with the text. Perhaps, however, the work may be read most agreeably and usefully, by first perusing the text of a Section through, and afterwards taking all the notes appended to it together. Those, however, who prefer small books to large, especially on theological subjects, may gratify their taste by confining their reading to the text alone: if this should sufficiently interest them to raise a further appetite, they can then, if they please, read the notes also. But the Author hopes that none will conclude, from a perusal of the text alone, that he has failed to establish his points; since in the notes many objections are answered, and many subjects are investigated, without which the argument of the text must want its proper light.

The greater part of the Author's direct controversy with the Rev. Mr Beaumont, is, however, properly thrown into the Appendix, because the work itself is formed upon a far more general plan than that of a mere answer to his publication. Indeed, in the Author's estimation, that gentleman's "*Anti Swedenborg*" was scarcely of sufficient importance to deserve an answer; but he was not sorry to use the opportunity afforded by it for placing the subjects it brings forward in their just light before the view of the public.

[N. B. — In the present edition of this Appeal, the Appendix, and some of the notes have been omitted; this has been done, partly to reduce the size and price of the volume and partly because it was not thought necessary to republish in this country the more controversial parts of the work.]—PUB.

---

FOR SALE BY THE PUBLISHER,

The following Works, by the Author of this Appeal:—

- ON THE PLENARY INSPIRATION OF THE SCRIPTURES, 1 vol. 8vo, \$2.25.  
 ON THE TRUE OBJECT OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP,—a Tract, 10c.  
 ON REGENERATION AND GOOD WORKS,—a Tract, 10c.  
 ON THE ATONEMENT,—a Tract, 10c.

Also, just published, a volume of TRACTS, selected from the writings of SWEDENBORG, and containing a BRIEF EXPOSITION OF THE DOCTRINES OF THE NEW JERUSALEM CHURCH, 12mo. price 62 1-2 cts.



# CONTENTS.

THE REFERENCES TO THE NOTES ARE MARKED BY AN (n)  
BEFORE THE NUMBER OF THE PAGE.

## SECTION I.

INTRODUCTION, . . . . . Page 1  
The occasion and design of the work, 1.

## SECTION II.

THE SECOND COMING OF THE LORD, . . . . . 7  
I. *That it is not a coming in Person, but is a restoration of the knowledge and influence of the truths of the Word of God, 8.*—II. *That there are many circumstances and signs at the present day, which indicate that the time for the fulfilment of these prophecies has arrived, 16.*—III. *That there are also many circumstances which evince, that the restoration of true religion, promised under the above figures, cannot be much longer delayed, without fatal consequences, 21.*—IV. *That these views cannot be justly charged with enthusiasm, but that they furnish the best antidote to all spiritual delusion, 26.*

## SECTION III.

THE RESURRECTION, . . . . . 29  
*That man rises again immediately after death, and is then a real substantial man in perfect human form; and that the Resurrection spoken of in Scripture is not a resurrection of the material body, 30*

## SECTION IV.

THE LAST JUDGMENT, . . . . . 64  
I. *That the General Judgment announced in Scripture was not to take place in the natural world, but in the spiritual, 68.*—II. *That the Last Judgment has been accomplished, 91.*

## SECTION V.

A HUMAN INSTRUMENT NECESSARY, AND THEREFORE GRANTED,  
111  
I. *That whenever the time for the accomplishment of the Last Judgment and the Second Coming of the Lord shall have arrived, some Human Announcer of the fact, and of the truths to be then discovered, must be commissioned to declare them, 111.*—II. *Examination of the claims of Swedenborg to be received into this capacity, 113.*—III. *The charge against him of Insanity, considered, 124.*—IV. *The objection against Swedenborg, that he wrought no miracles, considered, 132.*

## SECTION VI.

HEAVEN AND HELL, AND THE APPEARANCES IN THEM AND IN  
THE INTERMEDIATE REGION OR WORLD OF SPIRITS, . . . 156  
I. *Great prejudices against Swedenborg for professing to have had communication with the spiritual world; yet that, in his case, this was appropriate, and necessary, 158.* How the author's own prejudices on this subject were surmounted, (n) *ib.*—II. *Mr Beaumont's injurious assertion respecting the tendency of Swe-*

denborg's, descriptions of the invisible world, considered, 160.—That Swedenborg's views of heaven are such as must render it in the highest degree attractive to the justly feeling mind, (n) 162.—III. *That, in order to the right understanding of Swedenborg's statements respecting the Appearances in the spiritual world, certain general truths are necessary to be known, 167.*

THE EXISTENCE OF THE MARRIAGE-UNION IN HEAVEN, AND OF AN OPPOSITE CONNEXION IN HELL, (n) . . . . . 183

That the Scriptures represent the Lord Himself as one of the parties in a Marriage-union, and the Church as the other, (n) 185

#### SECTION VII.

THE TRINITY, AS CENTERED IN THE PERSON OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, . . . . . 201

The New-Jerusalem doctrine of the Trinity takes all that is true in other systems separated from all that is false, and is such as, it might be expected, all would gladly accept, 203.—I. *Solution of the objections arising out of the belief, that the Being who became incarnate was a Son of God born from eternity, 206.*—II. *Solution of the objections derived from the fact, that the Lord Jesus Christ, while in the world, sometimes spoke as if the Father were a Being separate from himself.* That the reason was, because, so long as he was in the world, there was a part of his nature which was not divine; but that it was glorified successfully, so that, at his ascension, all was divine, and one with the Father, 209

#### SECTION VIII.

THE ATONEMENT AND MEDIATION OF JESUS CHRIST, . . . 218

What the Atonement is, according to the Apostle Paul, 219.—Scripture use and meaning of the word, (n) *ib.*—I. *That the Sacrifices of the Mosaic law did not represent the punishment due to sin, but the hallowing of every affection and principle of the mind, thus of the whole man, to the Lord, 221.*—II. *That the Sacrifice of Jesus Christ did not consist in his suffering the punishment due to sinners, but in the hallowing of every principle or element of his Human Nature to the Godhead, till the whole became a living sacrifice, or thing fully consecrated and hallowed, by perfect union with the Divinity, 226.*—That his sufferings, and finally the passion of the cross, were the means by which this sacrifice was offered, and thus by which we are delivered from hell and raised to heaven, 226, 227. That by the sacrifice of Jesus Christ the enmity or contrariety between man and God was first abolished in his own person, and then in us also; and thus atonement is effected, 229.—III. *That the Lord is called a Mediator in respect to his Humanity, because in this he has opened a new and living way of access to his Divinity, 230.* This beautifully illustrated, and with it the Lord's oneness with the Father, by Dr. Watts, (n) 231.

#### SECTION IX.

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE, . . . . . 235

Gross scandals advanced on this subject by Mr Beaumont, 235. *That a life of righteousness, but not of Pharisaic righteousness, is, as taught in Mat. v. 19, 20, the way to heaven; and that this doctrine, in all its integrity and purity, is that of the New Church and of the writings of Swedenborg, 237.*

# AN APPEAL, &c.

---

---

TO

THE REFLECTING OF ALL DENOMINATIONS.

---

## SECTION I.

### *INTRODUCTION.*

ALLOW me, with respect and affection, to address you, as men who assign their due value to serious things, on a subject of, as it appears to many, no inconsiderable importance.

The existence of a body of Christians who humbly trust that they belong to the New Church of the Lord, predicted in various parts of the Holy Scriptures and called, in the twentyfirst chapter of the Revelation, the New Jerusalem, has, for some time past, attracted a considerable degree of public attention. It is generally known that the Views of the Eternal World and State, and the Doctrines of Faith and Life, held by these persons, are those which are delivered, as deductions from the Word of God, in the Writings of the Hon. Emanuel Swedenborg; who is by them regarded as a distinguished servant of the Lord, raised up for this work by as express an interference of Divine Providence, as that by which a Luther was raised to effect the Reformation from the corruptions of the Church of Rome, or even as that by which a Paul or a John the Baptist was called forth to teach the great truths of Christianity itself, or to announce the first advent of its Divine Author. But while it has thus been known that such a body of Christians exist, and that such is the origin of their views and doctrines, the greatest misapprehension in general prevails as to what those views and doctrines are, and the grounds on which they are embraced; for, unhappily, they have been heard of by

the public at large, only, for the most part, through the misrepresentations and perversions of adversaries and calumniators. We, who have embraced them, feel an entire but humble assurance, that, were they seen in their true colors, all the Reflecting, of all Denominations, would immediately admit, that they are worthy at least of deep consideration and serious attention; and we are assured further, that, were such consideration and attention bestowed on them, numbers would rise from the investigation with a conviction of their truth. *If they are true*, to have just or erroneous conceptions of them cannot be a matter of indifference: permit then one of those who have not hesitated to stake their salvation upon their certainty, to address a serious Appeal to you in their behalf. Great activity has been used, through a great variety of channels, to possess your minds with totally false and extremely injurious conceptions respecting the illustrious Swedenborg and his writings: allow therefore, I intreat you, one who has maturely considered both, to disabuse you respecting them,—to disperse, by a fair statement, the clouds of misrepresentation in which the sentiments received by us have been involved,—and to bring to your acquaintance views of Divine Truth which appear to be at once elevated and well-founded; views which, we venture to assure you, challenge the strictest scrutiny of Reason, and come supported by the plainest testimony of Scripture. Yes, ye who prize the inestimable gift of Reason! permit me to say, that never was a more gross deception practised on mankind, than when it has been attempted, by idle tales and false imputations, to make you believe, that Reason, and what is commonly but improperly termed Swedenborgianism, are uncombineable terms. And to you, ye sincere lovers of the Scriptures! allow me to declare, that to persuade you that writings and doctrines like those we espouse, which place the truths of Scripture in their own genuine light, are at variance with the truths of Scripture, and that they originate in delusion, is to impose on you an extravagant delusion indeed.

Were I left to my own choice in regard to the form which this Appeal should assume, it would be different from that which I am compelled by circumstances to adopt. Having a rich store to select from of the most



luminous truths and most satisfactory doctrines, upon every subject that is interesting to a man, to an immortal, to a Christian, I naturally should give, to the most important things, the largest share of attention, bestowing a more cursory notice on matters of inferior moment. There are no sentiments entertained by us, or advanced in the writings of Swedenborg, which we are not satisfied are pure and genuine truths: but in every extended system of doctrine there are truths of higher and of lower importance; as in the system of the visible heavens "one star differeth from another star in glory," and as the representative breast-plate of Aaron not only included the ruby and the diamond, but also the agate and the jasper. In making then an Appeal to you in behalf of our views, were I left to pursue the most natural course, I undoubtedly should place the richer gems, the rubies and the diamonds, in the more prominent light, and give to the inferior a subordinate station. The great truths respecting the Nature, Person, and Attributes, of the Lord God Almighty; the work of Human Redemption; the duties of Repentance and Reformation; the process of Regeneration; the entire Inspiration and exalted Spirituality of the Word of God; the certainty of a Future Retribution; the true Importance of the Present Stage of Existence as that in which man makes up the form and character of his spirit and internal life, and thus fixes his state, either for happiness or misery, to eternity; the pure Glories of Heaven, and the real Terrors of Hell; the Wonders of the Divine Government, or of Divine Providence, which extends to the minutest occurrences of human life, and in all that it either appoints or permits primarily regards eternal ends:—these, and such as these, are the subjects which occupy the distinguished stations in the doctrines which we believe to be those of the New Jerusalem, and in the writings in which those doctrines are delivered: on these they present views which are indisputably heavenly and exalted: on these then the pen of an Apologist would naturally dwell at the greatest length and with the most delight, secure that in all that he should offer respecting them the mind of the unprejudiced reader could scarcely fail of finding the most decided satisfaction. But they who have set themselves to crush, if it were possible, the rising New Church in its infancy,—as Herod sent to slay

all the children in Bethlehem of two years old and under,—naturally take the opposite course. Some of them, indeed, as the late Dr Priestley and a few others, have undertaken to oppose the leading doctrines of our church by argument; but the greater number have endeavored to keep our real doctrines, as far as possible, out of sight, offering, and then combating, such a garbled statement of them as can give their readers no just idea of what they are; while they have ransacked the pages of our valued Author in quest of everything which, on being brought forward by itself, separated from its context, and from the explanations necessary to its right apprehension, might appear most repugnant to the ideas commonly entertained, and might with most plausibility be made the ground of opprobrious animadversion; especially when heightened by exaggeration and misstatement, which have often been supplied accordingly; not to mention the many absolute fictions, void of all foundation either in truth or in probability, which have shamelessly been propagated respecting Swedenborg, his writings, and their admirers. In appealing to you then in behalf of our sentiments, it is necessary to follow the course marked out by our opponents; and as they have endeavored to raise prejudices by chiefly dwelling upon parts of our author's system and writings which are of very inferior importance, I shall be obliged to give, to such subordinate points, a much larger proportion of attention than they otherwise would demand. I shall take then for my guide, as to the subjects necessary to be discussed and to be set in their true light, a late publication by the Rev. G. Beaumont, of Norwich, which he denominates "The Anti-Swedenborg: or a Declaration of the Principal Errors and Anti-scriptural Doctrines contained in the Theological Writings of Emanuel Swedenborg." My reasons for giving my Appeal a particular reference to this publication, are, first, because the author of it declares, that some Lectures delivered by me in the city of Norwich were the occasion of his work; and secondly, because this work has been the occasion of many misrepresentations of our sentiments and of ourselves in the theological Reviews and Magazines, the editors of several of which, taking it for granted that Mr Beaumont's reports and views are correct, have recommended his work, have repeated his statements and thus have given

a wide circulation to the injurious impression he has labored to excite. As observed above, had I chosen my own ground in this Appeal, the form of it would have been different from that which, under the existing circumstances, it will assume: but the advocates of the New Church, though without any confidence in themselves, are at all times willing, conscious of the invulnerability, in every point of their sacred cause, to leave the choice of the ground to their opponents, and to meet them in any line of attack they may think proper to adopt. To legitimate argument, (though it is seldom, alas! that any thing of that kind is employed against us,) we hope to be enabled to oppose legitimate argument from sounder premises; to misrepresentations of facts or sentiments, the statement of such facts or sentiments in their proper colors; to misapplications of Scripture, Scripture justly applied and fairly explained; and to the artifices of falsehood, the honesty of truth. But we will not return railing for railing; nor, because the most scandalous imputations have been fabricated to be affixed on us, will we retort with anything of the kind against our accusers. We commit the whole cause, with perfect composure as to the issue, into the hands of HIM whose cause we believe it to be; and while we are grateful that we have been enabled to behold the truth, on subjects of the deepest importance to human welfare, in, as we are satisfied, its own genuine light, we will not be offended with those who as yet see differently, nor cherish the smallest spark of personal ill-feeling towards the bitterest of our opponents. They, as well as we, are in the hands of a merciful God, who, as our doctrines assure us, does not visit with severity for involuntary, much less for well-intentioned error: and though we cannot but believe that our adversaries, especially when they misrepresent and malign us, are in error, we strive to cherish the hope, in every case where there is any possible ground for it, that the error is involuntary and well-intentioned.

Beside occasional notices of other assailants, I intend then, in the following pages, to answer all the objections raised by the Rev. G. Beaumont in the work above mentioned: I do not propose, however, to follow that gentleman's steps in a servile or captious manner, or to keep him or his objections constantly before the reader. My design rather is, to take occasion, from his objections,

to open, upon general principles, the subjects brought under discussion; so that this Appeal may include a general exposition of the sentiments of the New Church upon the most important of her doctrines, and especially upon those subjects, even when of quite inferior moment in themselves, in regard to which the most common and plausible objections, have been raised, and the most injurious misconceptions have gone abroad.

I intreat you then, my serious friends, to whatever denomination, as regards the profession of religion, you may belong, to enter on the perusal of this Appeal with candid minds, and with a sincere desire to see the truth, wheresoever, and with whomsoever, it may be found. And as the best preparation for thus seeing it, allow me to request you to raise your hearts, in prayer for right direction and illumination, to the Truth Itself Personified, the Lord Jesus Christ. We are assured in his unerring Word, that He is "the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world;"\* He declares himself that He is the "Truth,"† and again, that He is "the Light of the world," and that "he that followeth *Him* shall not abide in darkness, but shall have the light of life:"‡ whatsoever then may be your present opinions in regard to his nature and person, you cannot doubt, if you believe the Scriptures, that he has the power of imparting the light of truth to the mind that looks to him for it. Nor can you doubt that, to the reception of any gift from him, faith in his power to confer it is a necessary preliminary. When the two blind men intreated his mercy, while on earth, He said unto them, "Believe ye that I am able to do this?" and on their answering in the affirmative, "then touched He their eyes, saying, According to your faith be it unto you. And," the sacred record adds, "their eyes were opened."§ Who does not see the correspondence between the communication of the light of day to the eye and of the light of truth to the mind? and that the one miracle was performed to represent the other? Whatever then may be thought of the Lord Jesus Christ, evident it is that He is set forth to us in the Scriptures as the Being from whom the inestimable gift of the perception of divine truth is to be received; and that, in

\* John i. 9. † Ch. xiv. 6. ‡ Ch. viii. 12. § Matt. x. 28, 29, 30.



order to its reception, He is to be applied to with confidence in his power to bestow it. Be your ideas of Him then, in other respects, what they may, permit me to beg of you to believe, that He really has this power; to elevate your hearts towards Him with corresponding desires; and in this frame of mind to weigh the statements and considerations, which, in the following Sections of this Appeal, will be laid before you. Under this guidance, I cannot refrain from hoping, that you will be led to the conclusion, that what our opponents call "principal errors" are in reality momentous truths, and that what they denominate "anti-scriptural doctrines" are in fact the very doctrines of the Scriptures. But do not let the fear of being brought to this result by the devout experiments which I have presumed to recommend deter you from making it: do not refuse to put your minds, on this occasion, under the sole guidance of the Lord Jesus Christ, from an apprehension, that He who is the LIGHT and THE TRUTH may by any possibility guide you into error.

---

## SECTION II.

### *The Second Coming of the Lord.*

I will call your attention, my reflecting brethren, in the first place, to the important circumstance announced to us in the prophetic parts of the New Testament, and commonly known by the name of the Second Coming of the Lord; with the important consequence of such coming, or rather part of it, which is described in symbolic language as the descent from heaven of a New Jerusalem. For it is because we understand these great predictions in a different sense from that in which most persons at the present time apprehend them, and because we believe that, in their only true sense, they are at this day receiving their fulfilment, that so many attempts are made to hold up both us and our sentiments to derision. In this respect we are treated just as were the first converts to Christianity by the Jews. The Jews were looking for the coming of the Messiah, as the hope of Israel;

yet were they almost unanimous in persecuting the small band of their brethren who affirmed that their hope was fulfilled. Christians have ever been looking with hope for the second coming of Him whom the Jews rejected: yet are too many of them eager in the persecution of those who affirm that this hope also is fulfilled. To our case then may be most exactly applied the noble apology of Paul when pleading before Agrippa. "I stand," says he, "and am judged, for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers: unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews."\*

I propose then, in this Section of my Appeal, to undertake the defence of those who stand in the same situation among their brethren, the professors of Christianity, as the Apostle Paul and the other first Christians did among their brethren, the professors of Judaism: and I earnestly intreat you, as believers of the Scriptures,—as holders of the Christian's hope, candidly to consider what I have to offer. There is nothing in the sentiments I shall present which ought to offend any one, but, on the contrary, much that every one may regard with delight. If by any means prejudices have been instilled into the minds of any of you, permit me to request you to lay them aside till you have fairly heard both sides of the question; and pray do not consider me as your enemy, because, with much respect and affection, and without intending the smallest offence to any one, I lay before you what, from the bottom of my soul, I believe to be the truth.

First then, I propose to shew, That the second coming of the Lord is not a coming in person, as most persons, in consequence of taking quite literally the symbolic language of prophecy, have hitherto supposed, but that it means the restoration of the true knowledge of divine subjects, or of the genuine doctrines of the Word of God, accompanied with their corresponding influence on the heart; in other words, that it is the revival of the true church of the Lord among mankind; in which mode of considering it, it is more particularly meant by the manifestation of the New Jerusalem. In the sec-

\* Acts xxvi. 6, 7.

ond place I will shew, that there are many circumstances and signs in the situation of the world at this day, which plainly indicate that the time for the divine interference described in Scripture as the second coming of the Lord has arrived. In the third place I will point out, that there are circumstances in the state of the world at this day in regard to religion, which evince that the restoration of true religion, promised under the figures of a second coming of the Lord and establishment of a New Jerusalem, cannot be much longer delayed without the most serious injury to the best interests of the human race. And I will conclude with shewing, that there is nothing in our views of this subject which can be justly charged with enthusiasm, but that, on the contrary, they furnish the best antidote to every species of fanaticism and spiritual delusion.

I. With regard to the first of these subjects then, it is first to be observed, that nothing is more true than a remark which has been made by almost every commentator that ever wrote upon the fulfilment of prophecy; namely, *That the exact meaning of the prophecies is never understood, till the time of their accomplishment.* This was strikingly experienced in regard to the prophecies which announced the coming of the Lord in the flesh. Although the whole Jewish nation knew from those prophecies that a Messiah was to appear, and the more learned among them could even point out truly where he would be born, they were so much in the dark respecting everything else that concerned him, looking only for a carnal and not a spiritual Saviour, that when he did come they rejected him and put him to death. And even the disciples who received him,—even the twelve apostles whom he peculiarly selected,—so much partook of the common errors of their countrymen, that they disputed which of them should be the greatest, or have the highest post, in the temporal kingdom which they supposed he was about to set up.\* Even at the moment of his ascension they asked him whether he would not restore the temporal kingdom of Israel;† and it was not till they had received the gift of the Holy Spirit from their glorified Lord, that they had just ideas of the nature of that kingdom into which they had been

\* Mark x. 35 to 40.

† Acts i. 6.

admitted themselves, and which they were to preach to others.

Another remark of importance is also here necessary to be made; it is, *That even when the Apostles had received the gift of the Holy Spirit, it did not communicate to them, at once, all the truths of the Christian dispensation.* Thus they remained for a long time in the persuasion, that the gospel was to be preached only to the Jews. It was not till seven or eight years after the Lord's ascension, that Peter was convinced that it was allowable to communicate it to the Gentiles: it then required a vision and special revelation to induce him to do it;\* and he was strictly questioned upon it afterwards by his brethren.† It was not till ten years after this that they came to the conclusion, that the Gentile converts were not required to keep the law of Moses;‡ and they do not appear ever to have clearly seen, that the Jews themselves were exempted by the gospel from the observance of that law.

If then it was only by degrees, and as occasion required, that the truths which were essential to the full knowledge of the Christian system were revealed even to the Apostles, and that they were enabled to understand the precepts and prophecies of the Old Testament as they applied to the doctrines and circumstances of Christianity, it is no wonder if it be found to be true, in the third place, *That the prophecies of the Lord himself, and of the New Testament prophets, relating to his second coming at a future period then very distant, and to his revival, at such second coming, of pure Christianity, after it had suffered decline and perversion, were at that time hidden from the Church.* Accordingly, it is certain that the early Christians were so much mistaken respecting the purport of these prophecies, that they all expected that the second coming of the Lord was then immediately to take place; and even the Apostles appear to have supposed that they might live to see it. They knew that the Lord's coming was to be preceded by a corruption of his religion; and because they saw corruptors of it even then appear, they concluded that the last time was then arrived. Thus the Apostle John writes, "*Little children, it is the last time; and as ye*

\* Acts x.

† Ch. xi. 2, 3.

‡ Ch. xv.



have heard that anti-christ shall come, even now there are many anti-christs; whereby we know that *it is the last time.*”\* So Peter exhorts those to whom he writes not to be disheartened by the seeming tardiness of the arrival of the expected day, telling them, “that scoffers should come *in the last days*, saying, where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation.”† But that even this Apostle supposed, that the expected coming, attended with a literal fulfilment of the prophecies which seem to speak of the passing away of heaven and earth, would happen during the life of persons then living, is evident from his exhorting them thus: “Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, *looking for, and hasting unto, the coming of the day of God.*”‡ James speaks of it as near with equal confidence: he says, “Be patient, therefore, brethren, *unto the coming of the Lord.* Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and the latter rain: be ye also patient; stablish your hearts; *for the coming of the Lord DRAWETH NIGH.—Behold, the Judge STANDETH AT THE DOOR.*”§ As for the Apostle Paul, he speaks on the subject to the Thessalonians, as if both himself and they, or at least some of them, would certainly live to witness it: he says, “*WE which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them that sleep;*” and again: “*Then WE which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air:*”|| which so disturbed those to whom the Apostle wrote, that he found it necessary, in a second epistle, to desire them “not to be soon shaken in mind or troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as from us, as though the day of Christ were at hand,” (by which he means, were immediately to take place,) because there must “come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed,”¶—in which he refers to a prophecy of Daniel: nevertheless he declares that “the mystery of iniquity *doth already work,*”\*\* and thus still inti-

\* 1 John ii. 18.

† 2 Ep. iii. 3, 4.

‡ 2 Ep. iii. 11, 12.

§ Ep. v. 7, 8, 9. || 1 Thes. iv. 15, 17. ¶ 2 Thes. ii. 2, 3. \*\* Ver. 7.

mates that the expected coming of the Lord was by no means very distant. Accordingly, as the nature of the second coming of the Lord was not in that day openly revealed; just as the nature of his first coming had not previously been openly discovered to the Jews; the Apostles never offer any explication of it, as they do of other prophetic declarations which then had their accomplishment, but always speak of it in the same symbolic language as had been used respecting it by the Lord himself and by the ancient prophets. This language has in consequence been understood according to the literal sense only, by Christians in general, from that time to this: and thus, from age to age, mankind have lived in the expectation of beholding the Lord appear in the clouds of the firmament, and of being themselves caught up to meet him at his coming in the air.\*

But surely, whoever should reflect a little upon this subject might easily see, that this manner of describing the second coming of the Lord is purely figurative and symbolic; that it is couched in the purely prophetic style

\* This fact, that neither the time nor the nature of the Lord's second coming was explicitly revealed to the primitive Christian Church, nor even to the Apostles themselves, is of so great importance, that, though I think it is conclusively established by what is advanced above, it may be expedient to adduce further unquestionable testimony for its confirmation.

It is to be observed, that while the Lord Jesus Christ himself often speaks, in the gospels, of his second coming, he at times so expresses himself, that they who understand his words literally must suppose him to mean, that his coming to judgment was not to be protracted beyond the age in which he delivered the predictions. Thus one of the most full and explicit of his prophetic declarations is that in Matt. xxiv.—“Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heavens shall be shaken; And then shall appear the sign of the Son of Man in heaven; and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn; and they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory. And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other. Now learn a parable of the fig tree; When his branch is yet tender and putteth forth leaves, ye know that summer is nigh; so likewise ye, when ye shall see all these things, know that it is near, even at the doors. *Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled.*”

That their literal sense is not their true sense, is evinced by the fact, that they have remained unaccomplished for seventeen hundred years beyond the period, at which, according to that sense, their accomplishment should have taken place.

of writing; and all expositors admit that there is a distinct prophetic style used in the Scriptures, in which the ideas intended are representatively shadowed out by the images used for expressing them. Only look at the subject with some degree of elevation of mind, and you will see, that for the Lord Jesus Christ to appear in the clouds which float about the earth, at a height never exceeding a very few miles from its surface, in a form visible to the natural eyes of the inhabitants of the earth, is really an absolute impossibility.\* At his first advent, indeed, the Lord was beheld by men in the natural world, and even dwelt for a considerable time among them: but the reason was, because he was then in a natural body, not yet glorified, assumed from the mother, Mary: but, as I propose to shew in a future Section of this Appeal, during his abode on earth, and at his resurrection, he made his human nature completely divine, and it was in a glorified or deified human form, no longer partaking of the gross properties of matter, that he ascended to heaven: Hence he never was visible to any after he rose again, except when he expressly manifested himself to them, which was done by opening the sight of their spirits. Had he still been visible to the natural eye, how came it to pass that he never was seen by the Jews after his resurrection? Had he still been in a body that was obvious to the natural senses, how did he appear suddenly in the midst of his disciples, when they were assembled secretly, for fear of the Jews, and the door was fastened to secure them from interruption? Our natural sight will not penetrate through walls and doors; how then, to such sight, can that divine form be visible, which walls and doors could not exclude? Thus the Lord's glorified person can now only be made visible to man by opening the sight of his spirit, as was done in all the cases of spiritual appearance recorded in the Scriptures; and the Lord can only thus be manifested

\* The two advents of the Lord belong to two different dispensations: according to the order always observed in the Divine Economy, the things peculiar to a later dispensation are never openly revealed under a former; consequently, *It would have been inconsistent with the order always observed in the Divine Economy, had the Apostles, whose province it was to proclaim the Lord's first advent, with the discoveries proper to it, been equally well informed respecting the circumstances of his second.*

to those who are in the acknowledgment of him: for this reason he never made himself visible, after his resurrection, to the gainsaying Jews; and for the same reason he never will make himself visible to the inhabitants of the world at large: consequently, it is not in a natural sense that he will appear in the clouds of the sky, shewing himself to all the dwellers upon the earth.

But that the Lord is not literally to make his second advent in this manner, is evident from another consideration, the force of which every one may appreciate, whether he sees the strength of the last argument or not: and that other circumstance is, that in other passages of Scripture his coming is described in a different manner. In the nineteenth chapter of the Revelation, he is described as coming riding on a white horse, with all the armies of heaven following him upon white horses. Now, who ever understood that this description was to be taken literally? No person ever conceived that He would come to judgment riding on horseback, followed by innumerable troops of angels, all likewise mounted on horseback: yet there is no more reason for rejecting the expectation of his coming in this manner, and regarding the language as entirely figurative, than there is for adopting that of his coming in the clouds, and regarding this as a literal representation of the fact. The truth is, that both are entirely figurative, and of nearly the same signification; since his coming on a white horse denotes his restoring the right understanding of the Word, and illuminating thereby the intellectual faculties of man, and his coming in the clouds with power and great glory denotes the unfolding of the literal sense of the Word, and his presence in the bright glory of its spiritual and genuine signification. I have endeavored to prove this at length in another publication; in which it is attempted to be shewn, that the Lord is called the Son of man, in Scripture, in reference to his character as the Word or Divine Truth;\* and it is always by his title of Son of man that the Lord himself speaks of his second coming: So, the passage just referred to in the Revelation expressly states, that he who is to come riding on the white horse, is the Word of God. Evidently then the promised coming of the Lord as the Son of man and the

\* Plenary Inspiration, &c. p. 333, &c.



Word of God, must denote a new discovery of the divine truth of his Word,—a restoration of the genuine doctrines of the church,—a revival of a just knowledge of the Lord and of his worship, and an opening of the sacred contents of his Holy Word.

But that this is, in general, what is meant by the second coming of the Lord,—by the appearing of the Son of man in the clouds with power and great glory, and by his riding in heaven, as the Word of God, on a white horse,—is further evident from the fact, that it is to be accompanied or followed by the descent from heaven of a New Jerusalem. We read in Rev. xxi. “I saw a new heaven and a new earth, for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away; and there was no more sea. And I John saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them and be their God.”\* Now what can this, with any degree of consistency, be understood to signify, but a renewal of the true church of God among mankind? Many, I know, apply it to the state of the saints in heaven: but in this they do the most palpable violence to the words: for how can that be pretended to be *in* heaven, which is expressly said to come down *out of* heaven? how can that describe the state of saints in *heaven*, which is expressly said to be the tabernacle, or abiding place of God *with men*? Accordingly, the best interpreters apply it to a new state of the church on earth. Thus Dr Hammond, a celebrated writer of the Church of England, comments upon it thus: “That it signifies not the state of glorified saints in heaven, appears by its descending from heaven in both places [where it is mentioned;] and that, according to the use of the phrase, ch. x. 1. and xviii. 1, is an expression of some eminent benefit to the church: and being here set down, with the glory of God upon it, it will signify the pure Christian Church, joining Christian practice with the profession thereof, and that in a flourishing condition, expressed by the new heaven and new earth. In this sense,” he adds, “we have the supernal Jerusa-

\* Ver. 1, 2, 3.

lem, (Gal. iv. 26) and the New Jerusalem (Rev. iii. 12), where, to the constant professor, is promised, that God will write on him the name of God, and the name of the city of God, the New Jerusalem; which there is the pure Catholic Christian Church." As to its being first said, that John saw a new heaven and a new earth, because the former heaven and earth had passed away, all commentators admit, that that is a phrase constantly used in the prophetic style to denote a complete renovation of the thing treated of,—the putting an entire end to one order of things, and the commencement of a new one, either with respect to particular or to general churches; in which sense it occurs in numerous passages of the Old Testament, where a new heaven and earth cannot literally be meant.\*

II. Here then, I trust you will admit, we have a clear and, at least, highly probable view of the signification of the prophecies which announce a Second Coming of the Lord, and the manifestation of a New Jerusalem: the next consideration is, Are there any circumstances and

\* The common reader of the Scriptures naturally supposes, when he comes to a prophecy respecting the passing away of heaven and earth, that the phrase refers to the end of the world; though the most simple reader must be somewhat puzzled to understand how the new heaven and new earth spoken of as to succeed the former, can relate to the state of saints in heaven, which is the only state that our natural apprehensions lead us to look for after the end of the world. The learned, however, have long been so fully convinced, that these phrases do not in general relate to the end of the world, and to the state of the saints expected to succeed that event, that it is wonderful how they can still retain the opinion, that the end of the world is, nevertheless, predicted by any of them.

In the Old Testament as well as in the revelation, the formation of new heavens and earth is mentioned in connexion with the restoration and re-establishment of Zion or Jerusalem: the reason is, because Zion and Jerusalem are constantly mentioned in prophecy as types of the church itself. In the Old Testament, when their restoration is spoken of, they are evident types of the church which was to be raised in consequence of the Lord's coming into the world, and called the Christian church, to distinguish it from the Israelitish or Jewish; consequently, in the Revelation, a new Jerusalem can mean nothing else than a new Church,—a restoration of pure Christianity to more than its primitive glory. And both these events are said to be accompanied with the formation of a new heaven and new earth, to denote the entire newness of the respective churches as to their inward life and outward conversation, internal principles and external practice; all the corrupt persuasions and evils which had perverted the former churches being wholly removed.

signs observable at the present day, which lead to the conclusion, that the time for the great divine interference thus prophetically delineated has arrived? Permit me, before I proceed to offer an answer to this question, to observe, that an affirmative reply does not, as too many are inconsiderately apt to suppose, necessarily involve an absurdity. All who acknowledge the authority of the Scriptures, must allow, that the Second Coming of the Lord most assuredly will take place at some period or other; and if, as I trust has been conclusively shewn, the commonly imagined mode of his appearance cannot be the true one, it is the more probable that it will take place, as is also plainly predicted, in an unexpected time and manner;—"in such an hour as ye think not, the Son of man cometh."\* It is to be expected then, that, come when it may, multitudes—perhaps the majority—of the Christian world will be unwilling to credit the tidings, and will deride those who believe them as silly enthusiasts:—as the Lord declares again, "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith in the earth?"† When therefore we announce to the world our belief, that this consummation of divine prophecy is now taking place, we are aware that we shall draw upon ourselves the contempt and ridicule of the superficial and the frivolous: but we are at the same time sure, that all the sober and the reflecting,—all who will candidly examine the reasons which have brought us to this conviction, must become sensible of their strength, and will find it no easy matter to put them aside. Certain it is, that all divine prediction must one day be fulfilled: if then what is advanced in proof of such fulfilment having taken place be not altogether unworthy of the subject, they who urge it are at least entitled to be listened to with candor, and to have their arguments fairly considered. If, on the contrary, the mere asserting that the time has arrived for the accomplishment of a great Scripture-prophecy, is sufficient to authorize the treatment of those who advance it with derision and contempt, then it was right in the Scribes and Pharisees to treat with contempt the testimony of the Baptist; and it will be difficult to prove them wrong when they crucified the Saviour himself.

\* Matt. xxiv. 44.

† Luke xvii. 8.

If then the view of the nature of the promised **Second Advent** of the Lord and descent of the **New Jerusalem** which has now been imperfectly sketched, should be deemed probable and satisfactory, I might urge, that the publication, in the present day, of a system of Christian doctrine in which such a view is afforded, alone gives reason to apprehend, upon the principle that the prophecies of Scripture are never exactly understood till the time of their accomplishment, that the time for the accomplishment of these great prophecies has arrived, or, at least, must be near at hand. It is indeed true, as has been shewn, that many have before concluded, from the known signification of Jerusalem in prophetic language, as denoting the church, (a signification explicitly assigned it by the apostles,)\* that the **New Jerusalem** of the **Apocalypse** must signify a new and greatly improved state of Christianity in the world: our explication then of this sublime prophecy is not new, except in regard to the greater precision with which the particulars of its signification are unfolded: but the explication of the prophecy of the coming of the Lord in the clouds of heaven, as denoting his presence in the literal sense of his Word and the unfolding of the bright glory of its spiritual or internal sense, was never known in the church, till delivered in the doctrines which we believe to be those of the "**New Jerusalem**:" if then this is the true explication, (and that it is so is capable of being proved with a weight of evidence that makes negation difficult,†) this circumstance alone affords a sign, that the time for the accomplishment of these predictions, in their true sense, which is their spiritual sense, has arrived. The mere statement of this argument here may not appear to carry much weight: but when it is connected with a knowledge of what the doctrines which we believe to be those of "**the New Jerusalem**" are; when these doctrines are seen to exhibit all the great truths of pure Christianity in a clearer light than ever they were placed in before, and to discover with demonstrative evidence the errors of the sentiments by which

\* Gal. iv. 26; Heb. xii. 22.

† See some of this evidence in "**The Plenary Inspiration**," &c. in the passage referred to in a former note, and in the Appendix to that work, No. iv.



their genuine lustre has been long obscured; when, together with the doctrines of pure Christianity, the spiritual sense of the Scriptures is seen to be truly unfolded, its existence demonstrated, and the Word of God proved in consequence to be the Word of God indeed:—When, I say, these truths are seen, as they may be seen, in the Writings of the Author we so highly esteem; every mind which duly appreciates them will be apt to conclude, that such discoveries could never have been made by any unassisted human intellect, and that the only probable way of assigning them an origin, is, to regard them as a consequence of that Second Coming of the Lord which they announce. I do not however insist upon this argument at present; but I trust that some of the considerations which give it weight, will appear in the progress of this Appeal.

But beside such evidences that the present is the era of the Second Coming of the Lord as require examination to discern them, are there none which may be obvious even to the superficial observer? It is said, that “every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him;”<sup>\*</sup> words which imply, that his coming must be attended with signs perceptible to every understanding, even to those who do not and will not acknowledge him, how palpably soever the signs may declare his advent: Are there then any such signs as these exhibited before the world at this day? I answer without hesitation, such signs are abundant and obvious; so much so, that there is not one person in this country, possessing a share of information and observation sufficient to raise him above the most stupid of the vulgar, who has not remarked them with astonishment,—who does not behold them making continually fresh calls upon his attention. It is true, that, though the signs are obvious, the true cause from which they proceed is not generally adverted to: Because the manner of the Lord’s second coming, like that of his first coming, differs from the common expectation, his presence is not generally discerned now, any more than it was then: But this only strengthens the parallelism of the case; since the Lord rebuked that generation also, because they could not “discern the signs of the times.”<sup>†</sup> But whether discerned,—rightly weigh-

\* Rev. i. 7.

† Matt. xvi. 3; Luke xii. 56.

ed and discriminated,—or not, the signs have been such as to force themselves on the notice of all. Does not every voice confess that we are living in a most extraordinary era of the world? Is not every mind impressed with the conviction, that there is something almost preternatural in the character of the present times? Has not the change which has taken place during the last thirty or forty years, the seeds of which had been fermenting for twenty or thirty years previously, in the whole aspect of Europe, of Christendom, of the world, such as has filled with amazement every one who has witnessed it, every one who contemplates it? After every section of the great family of mankind has been seen struggling through convulsions which seemed to threaten the dissolution of all human society, does not order,—a new and improved order,—appear again to be emerging out of chaos? Are not extraordinary improvements, in everything connected with the comforts of human life, and the advancement of the species in civilization, in knowledge, and, ultimately, in virtue, continually springing up? and are they not continually calling forth, from every quarter, exclamations of surprise, and expanding every bosom with the hope, that the opening of a new and happier day than the world has ever before seen is now dawning on mankind? But I forbear to enter more particularly into this delightful part of my argument at present, as it will be necessary to turn to it again when I come, in the next Section but one, to treat of the Last Judgment,—a subject intimately connected with that of the Second Coming of the Lord. Meanwhile, this slight hint may suffice, perhaps, to open new ideas in the minds of the Reflecting, when they turn their attention to these striking facts. At present I will only say, that in the wonderful visitations of Providence, both in the way of judgment and of mercy, which the present generation has witnessed and is witnessing still, *we* behold plain signs of the times of the Second Advent. They are such, unquestionably, as are commensurate with the grandest cause which can be assigned for their production: and how can they so worthily be considered, as by beholding in them the results of the fulfilment of the last great predictions of Holy Writ,—as by viewing them as harbingers of the Second Coming of the Lord?

Ultima cumæi venit jam carminis ætas :  
 Magnus ab integro sæclorum nas citur ordo :  
 Jam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna.

III. But, in the third place, while there are many circumstances and signs in the political and social aspect of the world at this day, which indicate that the time for the divine interference described in Scripture as the Second Coming of the Lord has arrived; are there not also circumstances in the situation of the world in regard to religion, which evince, that the restoration of true religion, promised under the figures of a Second Coming of the Lord and establishment of a New Jerusalem, cannot be much longer delayed without the most serious injury to the human race? It may at first perhaps appear paradoxical, that I should, on the one hand, advert to signs of the times which promise to the human race a new career of improvement and happiness, and draw thence an argument for the present being the era of the long expected Second Coming of the Lord; and, on the other hand, that I should point to signs which threaten to the human race most serious injury, to deduce thence also an argument in proof of the same position. But when the matter is accurately inspected, it will be found that there is here no inconsistency, and that the two arguments, instead of neutralizing, do in reality strongly support each other. For all the pleasing circumstances that have been alluded to only refer to man as a rational being and an inhabitant of this world; his state in regard to religion refers to him as a spiritual being also, and the destined inhabitant of eternity: an improvement of his condition in the former respect evinces an increased action of the divine influences in his behalf, the ultimate aim of which is to effect an improvement of his condition in the latter; but could the designs of Providence in this respect be frustrated, no improvement of the lower kind could bring real blessings, or could possibly be permanent. When a piece of new land is to be brought into cultivation, the first thing to be done is to clear the surface of its useless products, and to prepare the soil; the next is, to sow the seeds from which is to be produced the desired harvest. All improvements in the general condition of the human race, and in the natural powers and attainments of the human mind, answer to the process of the preparation of the

soil; and when it is thus prepared, unless the seeds of genuine Divine Truth be sown in it, the rankest weeds will spring up in abundance, and all the pains of the preparation be made abortive.

Here then let us ask a few questions. Do the views of religion generally entertained afford these seeds? Are the seeds which they do afford such as the soil of the human mind, in its present improved state of preparation, finds congenial to itself, and which it will willingly admit into its bosom? If not, is there not a manifest necessity, if man continues to be an object of regard to his Maker, that a new dispensation of Divine Truth, adapted to the present state and wants of the human mind, should be communicated from its Divine Source;—a dispensation by which the veil of error, in which the doctrines of genuine Christianity have been too long involved, should be torn away, and the face of pure Religion, in all the glory of her native beauty, should be again discovered to mankind? And should such a dispensation be too long withheld;—in other words, should the Second Coming of the Lord be too long delayed; is there not reason to apprehend that the rank weeds of Infidelity, which have already, in copious abundance, begun to appear, would overspread the whole field of the human mind, and blast all hopes of any real improvement, in wisdom and happiness, for the human race?

To consider each of these questions with the attention which its importance demands, would require more space than can consistently be allowed to this portion of our Appeal: I shall therefore answer them very briefly, and leave you, to whose reflections my Appeal is addressed, more maturely to weigh them for yourselves.

The first of them,—*Do the views of religion now generally entertained afford the pure seeds of Divine Truth?*—will perhaps receive a conclusive answer in some of the future Sections of this Appeal: for if it shall then appear that the Doctrines of Genuine Truth on the most momentous subjects of faith and life are different from those commonly maintained, it is evident, that pure divine truth is not in these to be found: and I had rather this should thus appear by inference, than enter into a



harsh exposure of what we esteem the errors of the prevailing views on religion.

The second question,—*Are the seeds which the prevailing views of religion do afford, such as the soil of the human mind, in its present improved state of preparation, finds congenial to itself, and which it will willingly admit into its bosom?*—may perhaps be answered without offence to any one: for it is a simple question of fact; and the fact, as obvious to every one, decidedly answers it in the negative. Is it not a fact which every one has observed, that the great bulk of mankind, at the present day, hold their religious sentiments much more loosely than was formerly the case? They, even, who are most decidedly convinced of the truth of the Christian religion in general, are, for the most part, much less tenacious than their fathers used to be of the truth of any particular scheme of it: indeed, were I to say, that few feel any considerable confidence in the truth of the doctrines held by their respective sects as the very doctrines of Christianity, I believe I should only state the sum of all individual experience on the subject. Among the evident signs of a great change which has taken place in the human mind, or in men's modes of thinking, this is one; that men are universally become more disposed than formerly to inquire into the truth of the doctrines which they are required to believe, and are becoming daily less and less capable of acquiescing in implicit faith without the exercise of their own reason and understanding: how then is it possible that doctrines, the chief of which have always been acknowledged by their advocates to be incomprehensible,—to be matters of such a faith as rejects all interference of the understanding, because, if the understanding were allowed its exercise it would reject them;—how is it possible that such doctrines can retain their influence over the human mind in its present altered state? Most unquestionably true is the remark of a celebrated Christian orator, that the forms under which religion is usually presented, though sufficient to feed with spiritual sustenance the minds of men in past ages, are no longer suited to the necessities of the present, but are become as “lifeless and bare trunks containing in them neither sap nor nourishment.”\* Unsatisfying dogmas, if they

\* Rev. E. Irving, in his Farewell Sermon at Glasgow.

led the well disposed mind to the acknowledgment of his God and Saviour and to the life of religion, might answer the main ends of true religion, so long as the human mind could simply acquiesce in them without inquiry: but when the human mind has come into such a state as to be satisfied with a blind faith no longer;—when it also is prepared, by the improved culture of its rational powers, for the reception of the seeds of the pure and genuine truth;—it no longer finds such unsatisfying dogmas congenial to itself;—it no longer can draw from them its needed stores of spiritual nourishment; and it refuses therefore to admit their seeds into its bosom. That this is, most extensively, the state of the human mind at this day in regard to the views of religion commonly prevailing, is too evident for the most determined advocate of those views to deny.

Then, assuredly, our next question must be answered at once in the affirmative; and it must be admitted, *That there is a manifest necessity, if man continues to be an object of regard to his Maker, that a new dispensation of Divine Truth, adapted to the present state and wants of the human mind, should be communicated from its Divine Source*:—in other words, that the long expected Second Coming of the Lord should in these times be revealed. This dispensation must be such, as to remove the clouds of error in which the beauty of pure Christianity has been long involved; to restore the right understanding of the Word of God, and conclusively to demonstrate its divine origin; to exhibit in a rational as well as Scriptural light the divinity of the Christian Redeemer, without the just acknowledgment of which no Church truly called Christian can exist; and to display in a satisfactory manner the nature of man's immortality and of his life hereafter, at the same time that it rediscovers the true nature of the means by which that immortality may be made an immortality of happiness. In short, it must be a dispensation which shall effect the union of reason with religion, without divesting the latter of its spirituality, as merely rational (as they are called) schemes of religion invariably have done; but which shall add spirituality to reason and exalt it with both. Whether the system of religion embraced by those who humbly trust that they belong to the New Church of the Lord, which they believe to be predicted in the Revelation under

the figure of a New Jerusalem, answers to this character, may in some measure appear as we proceed: but, without reference to any specific system, it seems difficult to deny, that the communication of such a dispensation of Divine Truth as we have here slightly sketched an idea of is essentially important to the present state and spiritual necessities of mankind.

For should such a dispensation be too long withheld, must we not answer our last question also in the affirmative, and conclude, *That there is reason to apprehend that the rank weeds of Infidelity, which have already, in copious abundance, begun to appear, would overspread the whole field of the human mind, and blast all hopes of any real improvement, in wisdom and happiness, for the human race?* The strong hold of Infidelity is, the irrationality of the doctrines commonly affirmed to be those of the Word of God. These are such as reason, when once it ventures to look at them, must reject: and when such doctrines are supposed to be those of the Scriptures, and the true nature of the Scriptures themselves is also totally misunderstood, the inevitable consequence is, that the Scriptures are rejected with them. Set then the Scriptures in their proper light; especially, prove that they are written by the laws of that invariable correspondence or analogy which exists by creation between natural things and spiritual, whence, while merely natural things are for the most part treated of in their literal sense, they are only used as types of purely spiritual ideas;—thus, prove that the Scriptures have in them a spiritual sense in which the wisdom of God in all its glory shines: then show what their doctrines really are, and evince that the genuine dictates of Scripture invariably harmonize with the genuine dictates of Reason,—that though they contain truths far beyond the reach of unassisted Reason to discover, they always are such as Reason, thus enlightened, accepts, approves, and can by numerous arguments confirm:—thus, exhibit the main topics of religion in their proper light; and you immediately deprive Infidelity of its power over the unsophisticated mind, that retains its unbiassed love of truth and desire of knowing it. But certainly, nothing like this is done in the views of religion commonly prevailing; and we see the awful consequences: we see, not only deism, but atheism, unblushingly avowed by numbers even in

this favored land; while on the continent of Europe it is too well known that they are far more universal, both among the Roman Catholic and the Protestant States. The fashionable school of divinity, even, through a great part of Christendom, led by the late Dr Semlar and the present Dr Eichhorn, allows nothing of the proper nature of inspiration to the New Testament, and denies it to the Old Testament altogether, insomuch that the Consistory of Wurtemberg have gone to the length of forbidding the clergy to take from the Old Testament the subjects of their sermons.\* Here are plain symptoms indeed of a growing tendency to Infidelity: Is there anything in the views of the Scriptures, and of the doctrines of Christianity, commonly entertained, which is capable of stemming the torrent? Is there not then reason to apprehend the most disastrous consequences to the human race, should the proper antidote be much longer withheld,—should the Second Coming of the Lord, in the sense explained above, be much longer delayed?

IV. To come to the conclusion of the present subject.

What has been offered, may, I would fain hope, have been sufficient to satisfy all who consider the important subjects with due reflection, that our pretensions are not very extravagant when we affirm our belief, that a new dispensation of Divine Truth is in reality in this day communicated, and that we are actually living in the age of the Second Coming of the Lord. But some of you, perhaps, may be afraid to give ear to the arguments presented by the signs we have considered, and to admit the belief, that the light by which they are discovered, and the doctrines with which they are connected, are really those of the New Jerusalem, for fear of incurring the reproach of enthusiasm. Enthusiasm is the charge with which the world is ever ready to stigmatize all who sincerely believe that God exercises a providence in human affairs, especially in whatever relates to his Church, and who practically admit the acknowledgement, that the predictions of Scripture are not to remain a dead letter for ever, but that it really is possible, that what Divine Truth has foretold, may one day

\* See the Intellectual Repository for the New Church, New Series, vol. i. p. 608.



come to pass. Indeed, none can consistently ridicule others for believing that a prediction of Scripture has come to pass, but they who in their hearts do not believe in the Scriptures at all, nor even in the Omniscience and foreknowledge of the Deity. It is true that there have been wild enthusiasts enow, who have grounded their idle fancies on the prophecies of Scripture. But how have such enthusiasts usually acted? By expecting some great thing to take place in outward nature, and themselves to be exalted to high honor and worldly dignity;—by fancying that Jesus Christ would come in person to reign on the earth, and that they that have faith to believe this would be made his vicegerents in the government of mankind;—with other extravagances of a similar kind, originating in a misconception of the true nature of divine prediction, and of the manner in which it is to be fulfilled. Look at the pretensions of the false Christs and false prophets that have arisen in different ages: and you will find notions of this kind to pervade them all. All such flights of enthusiasm find a complete antidote in the doctrine, which we are satisfied is as true now as at the Lord's first coming in the flesh, that his kingdom is not of this world. If we were to hold out, as enthusiasts have done, peculiar privileges on this side of the grave, we perhaps might, like some of them, soon find many more disciples; but they would be such as would not be worth having, because such as, like unconverted Peter, savor not the things of God, but the things that be of men.\* We have no worldly dignities to offer,—no, nor any short path to heaven. The only path to the blissful seats, with which we are acquainted, is the path of repentance and regeneration; and these works, we believe cannot be radically performed, but by the power of the Lord Jesus Christ, believed in as the Way, the Truth, and the Life, received in humility, and combined with hearty obedience on the part of man. The law that regulates admission into the New Church or New Jerusalem, is, that “there shall in no wise enter therein anything that is unclean, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie;”† by which we understand, that whosoever would be benefited by the new dispensa-

\* Matt. xvi. 23.

† Rev. xxi. 27.

tion of the everlasting gospel, must regulate his life, from his inmost thoughts to his outmost deeds, by the immutable laws of order contained in the divine commandments; especially laboring to remove from his affections whatsoever is inconsistent with the love and purity of the heavenly kingdom, and from his thoughts or opinions whatever is disowned by the Divine Truth, which constitutes the law of that kingdom: and this he must do in humble dependence upon, and devout elevation of his mind to, the Lord Jesus Christ, as Him who ever reigns in that kingdom, the King of kings and Lord of lords. We do not believe then that a new dispensation of the everlasting gospel is offered to man, to contradict, in the slightest degree, former dispensations, but to fulfil them, by introducing into them their proper spirit and life. We are convinced, that they who embrace the new dispensation should walk in newness of the spirit, not in oldness of the letter; that as all former dispensations have required men to love God and keep his commandments, so in this they must do so from a deeper ground in the heart and with more entire conformity in their practice. Thus we believe that the distinguishing superiority of the new dispensation will consist solely in these things:—the superior clearness with which the person and nature of the God who is therein to be worshipped will be seen, with a more plain discovery of the way in which an acceptable service can be offered to him, combined with the more powerful communication of a divine influence from him, enabling those who acknowledge him to fight successfully against their own corruptions, and so to render to him this acceptable service. Whilst then we point out to mankind the signs which demonstrate that the Second Coming of the Lord is arrived, we do not mean to fill their heads with idle fancies of no one knows what; but to enforce upon them the fact, that now are they called, more unequivocally than at any former period, to acknowledge the only true God, and to be assured that the first of all the commandments is, to love the Lord our God with all the heart, soul, mind, and strength, and that the second is like unto it—to love our neighbor as ourselves. We only wish to urge upon them the necessity of becoming such servants of God and such friends of mankind, by the assurance that every divine aid is offered that will enable

them to do so. If this be enthusiasm, it is an enthusiasm, allow me to say, which every sincerely well disposed mind ought by all means to foster: it is an enthusiasm which every friend of humanity ought to desire should become universal: for it is an enthusiasm which, if once made universal, would speedily banish evil and misery from the earth, and bring on halcyon days of universal contentment and peace.

---

### SECTION III.

#### *The Resurrection.*

The next subject which seems most naturally to demand our attention, after having considered that of the Second Coming of the Lord, is that of the Last Judgment; for that the execution of the Last Judgment must accompany the arrival of the Second Advent, is universally believed by Christians, and is most plainly announced in the Word of God. But here a question of great importance arises, respecting the scene of the last judgment,—whether it is to be in the natural or in the spiritual world. As the common opinion is, not only, as the apostle declares, that man is to be judged “for the things done in the body,” but also, beyond what either the Apostle or any other divine authority has declared, that he is to be judged *in* the body, the general expectation is, that the body is to be called out of the tomb for this purpose; and, consequently, that the scene of the last judgment is to be in this world of nature. The Scriptures have conducted *us* to a quite different conclusion. We are satisfied, upon their authority, which here assuredly coincides with the plainest dictates of reason, that, when the body is laid aside by death, we have done with it for ever; that man then becomes a living inhabitant of a spiritual world, in which he is to continue his existence for ever; and that, consequently, the Last Judgment can only be accomplished in the world in which all the human race are collected together,—that is, in the spiritual world, and not in the natural world, to which they who have once quitted it will return no more. Before then

you can decide upon the subject of the Last Judgment, it is necessary that I should appeal to you upon that of the Resurrection.

In my last section, on the Second Coming of the Lord, I had no occasion to notice the Rev. Mr Beaumont, or his publication, the *Anti-Swedenborg*; as, though that subject is of primary importance, and just views of it are essential to the right apprehension of some of the points against which Mr B. has directed his attacks, wherefore it was by no means to be passed over by me, he has not bestowed upon it any share of his attention. But the doctrine of the New Church on the subject of the Resurrection is assailed by that gentleman with peculiar vehemence; wherefore, in this exposition and defence of it, I shall chiefly shape my remarks with a direct view to his.

Allow me then to state, in a few words, the sum of our views upon this subject; they being such as we think are peculiarly adapted to recommend themselves, independently of all argument, to the Serious and the Reflecting.

We believe then the true doctrine of the Scriptures, upon the important question of the Resurrection, to be this: That man rises from the grave,—not merely from the grave in the earth, but from the grave of his dead material body, immediately after death; that he then finds himself in a world, not of mere shadows, but of substantial existences, himself being a real and substantial man, in perfect human form, possessing all the senses and powers proper to a man, though he is no longer capable of being seen by men in this world, whose senses and capacities of perception are comparatively dull and gross, owing to their being still shrouded over with a gross body of unapprehensive clay.

The latter part of this assertion, that the spirit of a man is a real substance, though not a material substance, and thus is the man himself, is capable of being proved, as may perhaps appear in the sequel, by most conclusive arguments, both from reason and Scripture: but, I will here confine myself to the former part of the doctrine;—that man rises from the dead immediately after death; and this virtually includes the other.

Permit me then here to give vent to my own feelings by saying, that this is indeed a “most glorious and



heart-cheering doctrine:" whereas to suppose, with the writer of the *Anti-Swedenborg*, that there is no real resurrection except the resurrection of the body, is to open the door to the most dark and gloomy apprehensions. What is become of the first inhabitants of this globe, and all who lived before the flood? Can any one seriously suppose, that they are out of existence, or, at best, have only a very imperfect and uncomfortable existence, because destitute of that body which has been undistinguishably mixed with the elements for five thousand years? and that they are still to pine for no one knows how many thousand years longer, before they will be themselves again, or can enjoy the happiness which Scripture everywhere promises to the saints without anywhere hinting at the immeasurably long, dreary interval of suspense, which they are to languish through before they can enjoy it? How does such a notion comport with the answer of the Lord Jesus Christ to the carnal-minded Sadducees, half whose doctrine, at least, has been translated into the creed of the opposers of the New Church: for the Sadducees affirmed, "that there is no resurrection, neither angel, nor spirit:"\* and the opposers of the New Church, such at least as the author of the *Anti-Swedenborg*, affirm, that there is no real resurrection but that of the body. But is not the answer of the Lord Jesus Christ to the ancient Sadducees, an answer to these modern ones likewise? "Now that the dead are raised," saith He, "even Moses"—Moses, who never openly treats of the subject,—but "even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob: for he is not the God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him."† Is not this affirming that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were living at the very time that this was written of them by Moses,—that they were not then slumbering in their graves? Most truly does our Accuser say, "that the doctrine of the *resurrection* may justly be called the key-stone of the gospel dispensation:"‡ but to say, as this author does, that the doctrine of the resurrection of the *body* is so, is grossly to pervert the plain meaning of the gospel-teaching. This writer, in his zeal for his body of clay, goes so far as

\* Acts xxiii. 8. † Luke xx. 37, 38. ‡ *Anti-Swedenborg*, p. 48.

to affirm, that to deny, not *the resurrection*, observe, but the resurrection of *the body*, if it is not the sin against the Holy Ghost, is, in his serious opinion, something very near it!\* and then, as if determined to cut us off from all hope of salvation, he adds, “to hear Christ say, ‘*I will raise him up at the last day,*’ and then tacitly [as he means to say we do] to give Christ the lie,”—such is his shocking language!—“must be a crime of no common description.”† But who that knows the use of language, would call the material body *him*? The Lord is not here speaking of *the body*, but of the *man*; “I will raise *him* up at the last day;”‡ not, “I will send his soul from heaven to gather up the ashes of his body.” And that man is not to slumber in a state of insensibility till the last day of the world, but that it is the last day with every man when he dies, is evident from the manner in which the Lord corrects Martha’s mistaken notion respecting it. “Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection *at the last day.*”§ Here Jesus perceives that she had in her mind only the notion of a distant resurrection: wherefore He replies, “I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and he that liveth and believeth in me, *shall never die.*”|| Here, because in the divine idea, no life but spiritual life is worthy of the name, the privilege of enjoying it is confined to believers; but of these the divine Saviour declares, that their life *shall never be perceptibly interrupted*. They have begun to live here, and they shall live on to eternity,—“they *shall NEVER die.*” To affirm, then, that there is no real resurrection but the resurrection of the body, and to apply all that is said upon the subject in Scripture to this imaginary resurrection; to affirm particularly, that it is the resurrection of the body which the Lord means, when he says, “I will raise him up at the last day;”—I will not adopt the coarse and profane language of our adversary, by saying it is giving Christ the lie,—but I must say, it is not only directly contradicting him, but it is making him contradict himself. Jesus Christ affirms, that he who believeth in him *shall never die*; and to prevent men from wonder-

\* P. 49, 50.

† Anti-Swedenborg, p. 50.

‡ John vi. 40.

§ Ch. xi. 23, 24.

|| Ver. 26.

ing how this can be, when men do die, to all appearance, at the close of their life in the world, he assures them, *that at the last day of this life they shall be transplanted into life eternal*:—"Every one that seeth the son and believeth on him shall have *everlasting life*, and I will raise him up at the last day." That would be a strange sort of *everlasting life*, which was to be interrupted by an interval of no one knows how many thousands of years. Even supposing that the body were to live again, it is quite evident that it is not *the life of the body* of which the Lord is speaking, when he speaks of *everlasting life*, since the life of the body, is not, upon any hypothesis an everlasting life: consequently, it is not the body of which he speaks when he says, "I will raise him up at the last day." The whole declaration is only applicable to the spirit, which is the man himself, to which the body is only an instrument of service while he remains in a world and state where its services are required: "The flesh," as the Lord says in the same discourse, "profiteth nothing."\* The spirit only is the real man: it is of the spirit only that *life everlasting* can be predicated: it is this only that can be raised to the eternal world: and this resurrection, the Lord assures us, the spirit shall experience, not after a sleep of ages, or at best a state for ages of half-conscious existence, but, in all the vigor of true life, as soon as it is emancipated from the shell of clay.

Our accuser, however, applying to the flesh all that is said in the Scriptures of the true resurrection, hesitates not to add reviling to his anathemas against those who can find in the Scriptures no such sentiment. "A doctrine," he says, "so glorious—so awfully sublime—so clearly taught in the sacred records [where it is not once mentioned]—so universally believed from the beginning of the Christian era [he might have said,—before the beginning of the Christian era,—for it is a purely Jewish doctrine, and from the Jews those Christians who did believe it received it]—so commonly believed by all sects and denominations of Christians even in our day, with the exception of Swedenborgians, who, as many will think, deserve not the name of Christians; this blessed doctrine I say, is not to be given up at the *ipse*

\* John vi. 63.

*dixit* of a madman," &c.\* I make no remark upon the liberality and Christian candor of this sentence, but appeal to you, my reflecting readers, to judge of it as it may deserve. But why is it that most Christians at this day hold the doctrine of the resurrection of the body? I answer, Because they have not searched the Scriptures for themselves, but, finding much said in the Scriptures respecting a resurrection, and having been told from their childhood that the body is to rise again, they conclude, with our accuser, that the resurrection spoken of is the resurrection of the body. And as we, for denying it, are to be put out of the pale of Christianity; and because our accuser here finds it convenient to call the intelligent Swedenborg, who proves its falsehood, a madman;—(though he elsewhere admits that a man who could write as he did could not have been very mad, though he thinks he must have been a little mad;†) as, for these reasons, nothing that we can allege against it from Scripture or reason is to be listened to for a moment, we will call another witness. It will not be said, I suppose, that the great reasoner Locke,—the author of a work on the reasonableness of Christianity, was not a Christian, or that he was a madman: and this great man has left on record a testimony of the conclusion to which every rational man, and every unprejudiced Christian, must come, who candidly examines the subject for himself. In his third letter to the Bishop of Worcester, cited also in the note at the end of the chapter on Identity and Diversity, in his *Essay on the Human Understanding*, he says, "The resurrection of the dead I acknowledge to be an article of the Christian faith: but that the resurrection of the same body, in your Lordship's sense of the same body, is an article of the Christian faith, is what, I confess, I do not yet know. In the New Testament (wherein, I think, are contained all the articles of the Christian faith,) I find our Saviour and the apostles to preach the resurrection of the dead, and the resurrection from the dead, in many places: but I

\* Anti-Swedenborg, p. 49.

† "It does appear to many, that either much learning, or something else unknown, had made Baron Swedenborg mad, if *not in the highest, yet in a lower degree.*" Anti-S. p. 6. And in pp. 7 and 8 some important doctrines of Swedenborg's are admitted to be excellent.



do not remember any place where *the resurrection of the same body is so much as mentioned*; nay, which is very remarkable in the case, I do not remember, in any place of the New Testament, (where the general resurrection of the last day is spoken of,) any such expression as *the resurrection of the body, much less of the same body.*" Mr L. afterwards adds, what many would find a useful caution against a too great facility in taking for granted that all that is usually delivered as the doctrine of Scripture really is such. "I must not part with this article of the resurrection," says he, "without returning my thanks to your Lordship for making me take notice of a fault in my Essay. When I wrote that book, *I took it for granted*, as I doubt not but many others have done, *that the Scriptures had mentioned, in express terms, the resurrection of the body*:—but upon the occasion your Lordship has given me, in your last letter, to look a little more narrowly into what revelation has declared concerning the resurrection, and *finding no such express words in Scripture as that 'the body shall rise, or be raised, or the resurrection of the body,'* I shall, in the next edition of it, change these words of my book, 'the dead bodies of men shall rise,'—into those of Scripture, 'the dead shall rise.'" Afterwards in strict agreement with our sentiments, which affirm that man rises with a real substantial body, though not with a material body, Mr Locke adds, "Not that I question that the dead shall be raised with bodies; but in matters of revelation I think it not only safest, but our duty, as far as any one delivers it for revelation, to keep close to the words of the Scripture; unless he will assume to himself the authority of one inspired, or make himself wiser than the Holy Spirit himself."

In these few sentences, it must, I think, be generally felt, that Mr Locke has fully anticipated all the arguments of our accuser as professed to be drawn from Scripture, and has shewn that the passages adduced by him as proving his favorite notion, in reality prove no such thing. Whether Mr Locke's own views on the subject were in all respects correct, is unimportant; he has here sufficiently evinced, that the doctrine of the resurrection of the body cannot be proved by Scripture. We will, however, run over the texts brought against us by Mr Beaumont, to demonstrate that Mr Locke is right



in his assertion,—that not one of them speaks of any resurrection of the body.

The three first of Mr Beaumont's texts are taken from a class of testimony which Mr Locke would not admit in this case,—the books of the Old Testament; for certainly, whenever the writers of the Old Testament speak of a resurrection, they speak of it in a manner so evidently figurative, that no judicious person would rely much upon an argument drawn from the literal sense of their expressions. It is true that the Lord Jesus Christ draws thence an argument against the Sadducees, which we receive as most conclusive evidence of the reality of a resurrection, and that it takes place immediately after death: but here we have the Old Testament expounded by an infallible Interpreter, and we receive the important truth upon the authority of the Interpreter, rather than because it is clearly discovered in the text from which he deduces it. Indeed, we are authoritatively assured by the writers of the New Testament, that the doctrine of the resurrection is not, in the books of the Old Testament, openly revealed: thus the Apostle's assertion, that "life and immortality were brought to light through the gospel," would not be true, if life and immortality had been brought to light under the law. In defiance, however, of the authority of the Apostles, Mr B. with many others, would fain have us believe, not only that the doctrine of the resurrection, but that of the resurrection of the body, may be clearly proved from the Old Testament.

He opens his array of texts with the celebrated passage of Job, "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though, after my skin, *worms* destroy this *body*, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me."\* This text, which is commonly understood to teach the resurrection of the body, affords a remarkable instance of the mistakes into which it is easy to run, when we read Scripture with preconceived opinions in our minds. For who does not see, whose eyes are not closed by his preconceived opinions, that this text has nothing at all to do with the subject? Job is here speaking of the wretched state of

\* Job xix. 25, 26, 27.

affliction to which he was then reduced, and declaring his confidence that God would interpose to deliver him *before his death*,—not at the end of the world. We read in chap. ii. that Satan, after having grievously afflicted Job in his property and family, demanded “permission to touch his bone and his flesh,” and that he “smote Job with sore boils from the sole of his foot unto his crown.” Accordingly, Job complains, a few verses before those quoted by Mr B., of being wasted away to mere skin and bone; which he expresses by saying, “My bone cleaveth to my skin, as to my flesh, and I am escaped with the skin of my teeth.”\* Because his friends reproached him, imputing his misfortunes to his wickedness, he adds, “Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O my friends; for the hand of God hath touched me. Why do ye persecute me as God, and are not satisfied with my flesh?”†—that is, still treat him as though he had not been sufficiently punished, though his flesh was all wasted away. Wherefore he proceeds to express his confidence, that, notwithstanding their uncharitable judgment of him, he may still rely on God as his Vindicator, Redeemer, or Deliverer, and that God will at last appear in his behalf; *not at the last day of the world*, (neither does the word *day* occur in the original,) but *at the conclusion of his state of trial*. When he adds, “and though after my skin, worms destroy this body, [where, likewise, neither *worms* nor *body* are mentioned in the original,] yet in my flesh shall I see God;” he does not mean to comfort himself with the thought, that though his body must now die, it will rise again, and he shall see God, in his flesh, perhaps ten thousand years afterwards; but he expresses his confidence that, though wasted to a shadow, *he shall not die*, but shall see God interpose in his behalf *while he still is living in the flesh* and has not put it off by death. Therefore he adds, that he shall see God for himself, and his own eyes shall behold him and not another’s: meaning, that God will not put off the vindication of his innocence till after his death, in which case, though another might see justice done him, it would be no benefit to himself, but that he himself shall experience the deliverance; and this notwithstanding his anguish, mental and bodily, was aggra-

\* Ch. xix. 20.

† Job xix. 21, 22.

vated to such a degree, that, as he adds, "his reins are consumed within him." Accordingly, all this pious confidence of his was justified by the event, and his hopes were completely fulfilled. At the end of the book, God himself is represented as interposing. In the passage we have been considering, Job says, "In my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another:" In the last chapter he says, "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee."\* In the passage we have been considering, Job declares his reliance that he should see God interfere as his Redeemer or Deliverer: In the last chapter God does interfere in this character; "and the Lord turned the captivity of Job, when he prayed for his friends: also, the Lord gave Job twice as much as he had before." "And after this lived Job a hundred and forty years, and saw his sons, and his son's sons, even four generations. So Job died, being old and full of days."† Can the parallelism between the expectation and the accomplishment be more complete? What violence then is done to the text, when the conclusion of the history is disregarded, and Job's hopes are referred to an imaginary resurrection of his body! And, surely, to put this text in the front, to prove the resurrection of the body, when it has no relation to a resurrection of any sort, is equivalent to an acknowledgment that the resurrection of the body is not a doctrine of the Scriptures.‡

\* Ch. xlii. 5.

† Job xlii. 10, 16, 17.

‡ To the above remarks may be added, that many of the most eminent of those who contend for the resurrection of the body, candidly allow that this famous passage has nothing to do with the question. This admission, for instance, is made by the learned Dr Hody, in his work in defence of the Resurrection of the same Body; and he cites, to the same purport, the following remarks of Grotius, which I translate as closely as possible: "Not a few Christians have used this text to prove the resurrection: but to do this, they are compelled in their versions to depart much from the Hebrew, as has been observed by Mercier and others. The Hebrew" adds Grotius, "is to this effect: 'I know that my redeemer liveth, and that He at last will stand in the field (that is, will be victor.) Although they (his distempers) should not only consume my skin, but also this, (namely, the fat which is under the skin,) nevertheless in my flesh I shall see God (that is, shall experience his favor:) I, I say, with these my eyes, I, not another for me. My reins have failed within me, (that is, my inmost parts are devoured with indignation at your reproaches.)'"

Mr Beaumont's next citation is the following: "Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth; my flesh also shall rest in hope; for thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption."\* This is so palpably beside the question, that it is needless to waste words in exposing its inapplicability. The declaration is made respecting a Holy Being, whose body was not to see corruption: but the bodies of all men do see corruption: consequently, this declaration does not relate to the bodies of men in general. Probably, then, most readers will prefer, to Mr Beaumont's application of the words, the application of them by the Apostle Peter: "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, *spake of the resurrection of CHRIST, that HIS soul was not left in hell, neither HIS flesh did see corruption.*"† Such was the force of this reasoning, that three thousand souls were converted by it: but the argument was a mere sophism, and they who yielded to it were not converted but entrapped, if, as Mr B. would pretend, the words are as true of David, and of every other mortal, as of the Lord Jesus Christ.

We are then presented with a passage from Daniel; where also, though it is not so obviously remote from the subject, a little reflection may convince any one, that the prophet is not speaking of the resurrection of the body. He says, "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."‡ Now most people believe, that, whether the body rises again or not, the resurrection extends to *all* whose bodies are deposited in the dust: yet this passage only says, that *many* of them that sleep in the dust shall awake: and this difficulty is so insurmountable, that the more candid of the advocates for the resurrection of the body acknowledge that this passage cannot relate to the subject. If we are to abide strictly by the letter in the

\* Ps. xvi. 9, 10.

† Acts ii. 29, 30, 31.

‡ Ch. xii. 2.



words *sleeping in the dust*, we must abide by the letter in the word *many*: hence, if we make the passage say, that many of the bodies which lie in the dust shall be raised, we make it say as positively, that some of them shall not be raised: and thus we involve the whole in contradiction. To sleep, and to sleep in the dust, are phrases belonging to that peculiar style of language in which the Scriptures are written, and which is framed from the correspondence, analogy, or mutual relation, established by the Creator between natural things and spiritual; which is such, that the former regularly answer to the latter, and afford exact images for giving them expression; as I have endeavored to explain in a distinct work on that subject. In this style of language, to sleep, and to sleep in the dust, mean, to be in a merely natural and sensual state of life; and to awake from this state to everlasting life, is to arise to a state of truly spiritual life, accompanied with eternal happiness; while to awake to shame and everlasting contempt, is to pass indeed into a spiritual state, but such a one as belongs to infernal spirits, accompanied with eternal misery. Thus to sleep in the dust, and to awake thence, have no reference whatever to the unconscious dead body, but to the man, of whom the dead body no longer forms any part. Hence we read, both of the wise and the foolish virgins, that while the bridegroom tarried, they all *slumbered and slept*; and surely no one ever referred the expressions, in this instance, to the body in the grave. So when the Apostle, paraphrasing the prophet, says, *Awake, thou that sleepest and arise from the dead*, and Christ shall give thee light;\* he certainly does not allude to the sleep of the grave, or address the dead bodies there but calls those who are slumbering in a merely natural state, and who are spiritually dead, to arise to a state of spiritual light and life. Thus also, when Isaiah exclaims, "Shake thyself from *the dust*; arise, and sit down, O Jerusalem;"† none understand the call to be addressed to the dead bodies of the Jewish people mouldering in the dust of the grave. Equally unfounded is the application of the prophecy of Daniel, respecting

\* Eph. v. 14.

† Isa. lii. 2.



*them that sleep in the dust, to dead carcasses in the tomb.\**

We now pass from the evidence of the Old Testament to that of the New: and though we shall here find explicit documents on the subject of the resurrection, we shall find Mr Locke's assertion to be true, that it, likewise, never speaks of the resurrection of the same [or the material] body.

The first passage hence cited by Mr B, is one which has been much relied on by the advocates of the resurrection of the body; and yet it is attended with particulars in itself and in its context, which make it utterly irreconcilable with that doctrine. "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation."† The specific reference of these words we shall probably see when we come to consider the subject of the Last Judgment; but that they do not relate to any resurrection of deceased bodies, to take place many hundreds, probably many thousands of years after the words were uttered, is evident from this circumstance; that the great event referred to, whatever may be its true nature, is spoken of in the present tense,—the hour *is coming*,—indicating, that the event was immediately about to take place. This is the constant import of the verb *to come* when used in the present tense, both in common language and in the language of Scripture. If the Divine Speaker had been referring to an event so distant as experience has now proved that the resurrection of the body, if ever it takes place, must then have

\* I have explained the above text of Daniel according to its spiritual sense, because I am of opinion that it really does relate, as they who apply it to the resurrection of the body suppose, to the last judgment; and it is only in its spiritual sense that it refers to that event. But they who apply it to the resurrection of the body take it in its merest literal sense. That it has also, subordinately, a literal or natural sense, I readily admit: but in that sense it certainly relates neither to the resurrection of the body nor to the last judgment. Let any one examine the context, and then decide whether, in the literal sense, it can possibly refer to the last judgment; and if not, neither can it, even in that sense, refer to the resurrection of the body.

† John v. 28.

been, he would not have said "the hour *is coming*," but "the hour *will come*;" as when he says, in Luke, "The days *will come* when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of man:"—when he says, "the hour *cometh, or is coming*," he certainly means, *is presently at hand*.\* But if the mode of expression be not itself deemed sufficient to put this beyond all doubt, all doubt must vanish when the parallel passage, three verses previous, is consulted, of which this is only a more detailed repetition. The Lord there says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour *is coming, and now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God: and they that hear shall live."† Certainly, "the dead," "all that are in the graves,"—cannot mean, literally, corpses in the tomb; for all these have never yet heard the voice of the Son of God, lived, and come forth; although the Lord declares that the hour of which he was speaking, when this should take place, *then was*. Whatever then may be intended by these divine declarations, we here have conclusive proof that they do not announce the resurrection of the body. The language of the Divine Speaker must be figurative; in fact, it is that of analogy or correspondence. This is further evident from the next verse preceding which introduces the subject: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but *is passed from death unto life*."‡ Here, those who are in a merely natural state, are spoken of as being in a state of death, notwithstanding they are living by natural life in the world. This evinces that it is not of natural death that the Divine Teacher is speaking: consequently, "the dead," mentioned directly afterwards, are not they who are naturally dead, and "all that are in the graves" are not the dead bodies in the tomb.§

Mr B.'s next quotation is the Lord's discourse with Martha (John xi. 23 to 26): but how directly this contradicts his opinion, instead of confirming it, we have

\* See, for instance, John iv. 21 and 23. † Ver. 25. ‡ Ver. 24.

§ But it not only is evident, upon comparing the context, that "all that are in the graves," cannot mean all dead bodies, but it is shewn by Mr Locke, in the place cited above, that the words themselves, could they be separated from the context, cannot, without the greatest inconsistencies, be applied to such a resurrection.

already seen. It is true that, to strain it to his purpose, he would translate the last clause, "shall *not* die *for ever*," instead of "shall *never* die;" but every one who is acquainted with the idiom of the New Testament, knows that the words which, literally translated, are, "shall not die for ever," mean precisely the same as the English phrase, *shall never die*. By this phrase, therefore, our translators have honestly rendered them, notwithstanding they also had a predilection for the notion, that everlasting life is to have a great chasm in it.\* Thus by this divine declaration, the change in the state of existence made by putting off the body is treated as unworthy of any regard; it is represented as not even making a break in the course of existence: and we may be satisfied that the Divine Giver of everlasting life does not mock us with empty words, and call that everlasting life, or living for ever, which is presently to be discontinued, and, after a lapse of thousands of years, is to begin again!

Next we are presented with these words: "And as they spake unto the people, the priests, and the captains of the people, and the Sadducees, came upon them, being grieved that they taught the people, and preached through Jesus the resurrection from the dead."† No allusion here, we see, to any general resurrection of dead bodies: Indeed, this passage only refers to the resurrection of Jesus himself; for according to the original it is,—“and preached *in Jesus* the resurrection from the dead;”—that is, that in the person of Jesus a resurrection from the dead had taken place;—in other words, that Jesus had risen from the dead; which certainly constituted the main burthen of the first preaching of the apostles.—Again: “Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoicks encountered him (Paul.) And some said, what will this babbler say? other some, He seemeth to be a setter forth of strange gods: because he preached to them Jesus and the resurrection.”‡ Still

\* Dr Doddridge justly observes, in his note upon this passage, “To render the words,—*shall not die forever*, or *eternally*, is both obscuring and enervating their sense, and (as I have elsewhere shewn notes on John iv. 14, and John viii. 51, 52) is grounded on a criticism which cannot agree with the use of the phrase in parallel passages.”

† Acts iv. 1, 2.

‡ Ch. xvii. 18.

nothing about the resurrection of the body: indeed, this text also seems only to refer to the resurrection of Jesus.—“And have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust.—Except it be for this one voice, that I (Paul) cried standing among them, touching the resurrection of the dead I am called in question among you this day.”\* Still not a word about dead bodies.—“Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection.”† Here the dead whom the women received again certainly were restored in their bodies; they not only rose again in their bodies, but, as the necessary consequence of such a resurrection, they also died again in their bodies: but they hoped for a *better resurrection*, that is, *better than the resurrection of the body*.—“Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead.” Here, again, no resurrection is spoken of, but that of Jesus Christ.

“But the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished: this is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection.”‡ This passage refers to things that were to take place in the spiritual world, not in the natural, at the time of the last judgment, wherefore I shall consider it when I come to treat of that subject; at present I will only quote a little more of it, which our refuter has judiciously suppressed, because, if suffered to appear it would take the whole passage completely out of his list of proofs, and add it to ours. The preceding verse says: “I saw the *souls*” (mind this—the *souls*, not the *bodies*;—“I saw the *souls*) of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads or in their hands; and *they* (not the *bodies*, mind, but *they*, the pronoun referring to *the souls* before mentioned as its antecedent,) lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of *the dead*,” &c. Here then we

\* Ch. xxiv. 15, 21.

† Heb. xi. 35.

‡ Rev. xx. 5, 6.



find that these *souls* are called *the dead*, as having passed by death out of the natural world; as well as for another reason that will be mentioned hereafter: and as, while souls are mentioned, not a syllable is said of any bodies, or of the resurrection of the body, it surely is a palpable violation of the sacred text to apply this part of it to confirm such a notion.

The last passage which Mr B. adduces against us is this. "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first." I wonder he did not add the next verse, which appears still stronger: for the Apostle goes on to say: "Then we which are alive, and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air:"\* But I suppose the reason why Mr B. declined to add this to his quotation, was, because the language is so evidently figurative, that scarcely any can suppose that it is meant to be literally understood: and because, also, the Apostle here undeniably speaks according to certain mistaken notions, which prevailed in the first ages. The fact is, that this text does not so properly belong to the subject of the Resurrection, as to that of the Second Coming of the Lord; and as, according to what has been shewn above, the true nature of the Second Coming of the Lord was not at that time plainly revealed, therefore the Apostles never speak of it but in that prophetic style in which it had been predicted by the Lord himself, and which cannot be understood till spiritually deciphered.† Thus we have seen, that all the primitive Christians, and the Apostles themselves, believed that it was to take place in that first age; and the language which Paul here twice uses,—"*we that are alive and remain,*"—evinces, that he, at the time of his so writing, entertained the expectation of living to see it. This, experience has proved, was a mistaken opinion altogether; yet with a reference to this mistaken opinion, assumed as true, all the Apostle's remarks are here framed. The

\* 1 Thes. iv. 16, 17.

† See above, p. 9 and 12, and the note, p. 12 and 13; and I beg the reader to bear in mind what was there advanced, as the subject is of great importance, and what is here stated was there, I trust I may say, incontrovertibly proved."



Thessalonian Christians expected to live to witness the Lord's second coming, and then to be admitted into a kingdom of superlative glory, in a new heaven and earth to be created for the purpose after the destruction of the former: and they grieved for their deceased friends, fearing that none could enjoy the happiness of the Lord's new kingdom but they who lived to behold its establishment. Assuming then this expectation of the Lord's appearing, in this manner, and in the life-time of that generation, to be true, the Apostle applies himself to remove their gloomy apprehensions respecting their departed friends. He opens the subject with saying, "But I would not have ye to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope: for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him."\* Then he proceeds, "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord," [meaning, that he here repeats what the Lord himself had declared] "that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent [be beforehand with, or have any advantage over] them which are asleep."† The two verses cited above next follow; and they are purely a paraphrase of the Lord's own statement respecting his second coming, with the introduction of a clause respecting those who should be deceased, in regard to whom the Thessalonians were uneasy. The Lord had said, "They shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory; and he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other."‡ The Apostle says, "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first" [or "shall rise before," or "previously;"] as is the sense of the word *πρωτον*, in Matt. v. 24, ch. xii. 29, Mark ix. 11, 12, John xv. 18, ch. xix. 39, 2 Thes. ii. 3. 1 Tim. iii. 10, &c.]: "then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air." What can with certainty be gathered from this language,

\* Ver. 13, 14.

† Ver. 15.

‡ Matt. xxiv. 30, 31.

but that, as has been shewn before, neither the manner nor the time of the Lord's second coming were then revealed? Hence, with respect to the manner of it, we find the Apostle repeating, without explanation, the symbolic language in which the Lord had foretold it: and with respect to the time of it, we find him countenancing a most palpable error. Can any doctrine, then, with safety be drawn from his statement, beyond this; that they who "sleep in Jesus," actually are "with him,"—that is, that they are awake or alive towards him, though they are asleep towards us; or "that the dead in Christ were to rise" before his second coming, even though this was then daily expected,—in other words, that they rise in and with Christ as soon as they die here? And even if we understand as literally as we can the Apostle's words, respecting the dead in Christ rising first and *we* (which must now be changed into *they*) which are alive and remain being caught up into the air, still it will not follow that dead material bodies are thus to rise, or that living material bodies are to be thus transported; for, when speaking in a similar manner in another place, to be considered presently, he says, that "we shall be changed,"—shall change our material bodies for spiritual ones,—"in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye;" evidently teaching that, happen how it may, we are to be dispossessed of that "flesh and blood," which he affirms in the same place "cannot inherit the kingdom of God," and which are so little suited for flying in the air.

This brings me to the famous fifteenth chapter of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. We think that this portion of the Apostolic writings contains most decided statements in support of our views of the subject; and Mr Beaumont directs his reader to peruse the whole chapter from the 12th verse, saying, that "if, after so doing, he is not convinced of the erroneous doctrine of Swedenborg respecting the resurrection, then neither would he be persuaded though one rose from the dead."\* This certainly is perfectly true: for we are quite sure that if any one were to come from the other life to inform us of the nature of that much mistaken country, his testimony would be in agreement with the doctrine of Swedenborg and of Paul, that departed spirits

\* Anti-Swedenborg, p. 48.

there exist as perfect men, and would shudder at the thought of being again buried in a covering of clay.

First let us look at *the general scope* of the Apostle's argument,—at *the design* with which the whole of it was composed: for this will greatly assist us rightly to understand the particular expressions. Was it written to prove the doctrine of a resurrection, or of a future state, in general; or to prove the resurrection of the material body?

“Now if Christ be preached, that he rose from the dead,” says the Apostle when he commences the subject, “how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?”\* Does this mean, no resurrection of dead bodies; or, no rising in eternal life of those who have left this world by death? A few verses below we find an answer to this inquiry. The Apostle says, “If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised: and if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If *in this life only* we have hope, we are of all men most miserable.”† Here the plain scope of the Apostle's argument is explicitly declared. He is reasoning against those who confined their hopes of happiness *to this life only*. He is disproving the monstrous error of supposing that the Christian's hope terminates *here*: and surely this awful mistake is guarded against quite as effectually by the doctrine which teaches that we shall rise again, and appear before our Judge, immediately after death, in bodies adapted for the fullest sense either of happiness or of misery, as by the doctrine which teaches that we are not to be judged at all, nor even to have any distinct consciousness of existence, till the end of the world. Evident then it is, that the Apostle is writing against those who deny a resurrection altogether: not against those who do not expect a resurrection of the body. Accordingly, he says presently, “What shall they do which are baptized, for the dead, if the dead *rise not at all*?”‡ Now whatever this baptizing for the dead might be, the Apostle clearly affirms that the use of it would be frustrated, not if *the dead body never rises*, but if the dead *rise not AT ALL*. So he proceeds, still arguing against the idea, not that

\* Ver. 12.

† Ver. 16 to 19.

‡ Ver. 29.

there is no resurrection of the body, but that there is no future life, “And why stand we in jeopardy every hour? I protest by the rejoicing which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord, I die daily” [meaning, that he was constantly exposing himself to the danger of dying; and was also mortifying in himself the life of the merely natural man.] “If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink for tomorrow we die.”\* Here the Apostle puts us still more clearly in possession of the whole scope of his argument. Nothing can be plainer than that he is solely contending for a future life,—a state of retribution,—against the monstrous grossness of those who imagined that there is no resurrection whatever, and that when we die here we are extinct for ever. The resurrection of the body, then, has nothing to do with the main design of his argument.

The Apostle having thus settled so conclusively the main question, proceeds to answer those who objected to the doctrine of man’s immortality, in consequence of observing, that the natural body was cast at death into the ground, and was there decomposed, without anything of the man anywhere remaining visible.

“But some will say,” he observes, “How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Thou fool,” he replies, “that which thou sowest” (alluding to the operations of the husbandman) “is not quickened except it die. And that which thou sowest, thou sowest *not that body which shall be*, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or some other grain. But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed his own body.”† Here we have the most unequivocal assertion, that man does not rise again with the same body as is laid in the grave. And to show that man may have a different body suited to the different state on which he enters after death, he proceeds to illustrate it by similitudes from various natural objects. “All flesh,” says he, “is not the same flesh: there is one kind of flesh of men, another of beasts, another of fishes, and another of birds. There are also celestial bodies, and bodies terrestrial: but the glory” (or “form,”

\* Ver. 30, 31, 32.

† Ver. 35 to 38.



or "nature," as the original word here signifies) "of the celestial is one, and the glory of the terrestrial is another. There is one glory" (form, or nature) "of the sun, another glory of the moon, and another of the stars; for one star differeth from another star in glory."\* Was it possible to prepare the mind more naturally for the admission of the idea, that though the natural body rises no more, man is not therefore left destitute of a body, but has a better in its place? To what purpose could this enumeration of different species of bodies serve, but to answer the objections of those who concluded, that because the body which was laid in the grave remains there, therefore there is no resurrection of the man? He proceeds: "So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption: It is sown in dishonor; it is raised in glory: It is sown in weakness: it is raised in power."† Now he comes to the full, clear, New Jerusalem doctrine: "*It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body:*"‡ or, as the words might more exactly, and without any ambiguity, be translated, "*A natural body is sown; a spiritual body is raised.*" To confirm this grand idea, he solemnly repeats it as a general truth: "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body:"‡—a most certain fact this, on which the whole doctrine of the New Jerusalem respecting the life after death rests! "*There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body!*" and the latter is not less real, and less truly substantial than the former. In the next verse he illustrates this great truth by the example of Adam, though the reference is quite lost in our translation; in which it is given, "And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit."§ How does this illustrate the case of the natural and spiritual body? Because the word here used for *soul* ( $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ ) is that always applied by the Apostle to signify *the natural or animal soul; or the life of the natural or animal man*: it is the substantive from which the adjective always translated *natural* ( $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ ) in the New Testament, is formed: thus, to introduce the word *natural*, answering to what had gone before, we might read it, "the first Adam was made a living natu-

\* Ver. 39, 40, 41.

† Ver. 42, 43.

‡ Ver. 44.

§ Ver. 45.



ral principle, and the last Adam was made a quickening spiritual principle;" in other words, "The first Adam was endued with *natural life*, and the last Adam is the communicator of spiritual life:" with which idea in our minds, we see the propriety of the verse which follows: "Howbeit, that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterwards that which is spiritual."\* Thus the Apostle means to state this most accurately discriminated and beautiful truth; That there is just such a difference between our natural and our spiritual body, as there is between the nature which we receive by birth from Adam, and that which we receive by regeneration from the Lord. This he further illustrates by adding, "The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."† Here he shows, that, with the good, of whom alone he is speaking, the resurrection-body is the proper form and image of the regenerate mind. Then he makes this general statement: "Now this I say brethren, that *flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.*"‡ What can be clearer? How is this to be evaded? This is precisely what we believe. The Apostle is arguing as strongly as possible against the notion of the resurrection of the natural body, as being of such substance as cannot enter heaven; and in proof that such resurrection is unnecessary to our future existence, he demonstrates that there is a spiritual body, independent of the former, and which emerges out of the shell of clay when this is laid aside by death.

The Apostle now proceeds to speak of the manner and time of our exchanging our natural body for the spiritual one: And though what he here says may be understood in reference to a distant period, (though certainly that distant period, in the idea of the Apostle, was not to be protracted beyond the probable duration of his own life,) it also may be understood as taking place immediately: and I shall shew presently that it must be so understood, to make the Apostle consistent with himself.

\* Ver. 46.

† Ver. 47, 48, 49.

‡ Ver. 50.

He says, "Behold, I shew you a mystery: we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump: for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible; and we shall be changed."\* It is generally supposed that the Apostle here refers to a coming of the Lord to put an end to the world; and that when he says "we shall not *all* sleep," he means to say, that all will not previously die, but some will be then alive; wherefore he also says "the dead shall be raised," "and *we*," meaning such as shall be remaining alive, "shall be changed." It is not impossible that he might have such ideas, because we have seen that he had such when he wrote the passage above noticed to the Thessalonians. If so, this passage belongs to the same class as that: it evinces, with that, that the Lord did not see fit that the true nature and time of his second coming should then be openly revealed; whence even the Apostles were permitted to entertain, *upon this one subject*, obscure, and, in some respects, erroneous ideas,—to expect it to take place, as figuratively described, in the life-time of that generation, and probably in their own; whence Paul, including himself, here says, "*We* shall not all sleep," and "*we* shall be changed." However, whether he now had these ideas in his mind or not, what he has here delivered may certainly be understood as a figurative statement of the true doctrine of the resurrection, as delivered by himself elsewhere. "*We* shall not all sleep," must then mean, that we shall not sleep *as to the whole of us*. The trumpet must be mentioned as a figure to denote the great change made by death in the state of our perceptions, and our awaking to a consciousness of the objects of the eternal world: and that this takes place with every one as soon as the interior parts of his bodily frame are dead, which is not till some time after all perceptible signs of life have ceased, is well described when it is said, that the change shall be effected "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," without any interval of total extinction whatever. When the Apostle adds, "For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality,"† he cannot mean to say this of the natural body, "the flesh and

\* Ver. 51, 52.

† Ver. 53.

blood;" for this he had before declared "cannot inherit the kingdom of God,"—and that "corruption doth not inherit incorruption," or cannot be made incorruptible. He here then, speaking in a strong, animated style, must mean, that this corruptible state and body must be *exchanged* for the incorruptible, this mortal for immortal: and so he comes to the sublime conclusion, "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."

From this review, then, I think it is plain, that although a few expressions in this celebrated chapter may be interpreted in their own favor by those who look for a general resurrection at some distant period, and who think that our present bodies, though somehow miraculously changed, are then to be resumed, the words by no means require such an interpretation, and cannot well bear it if the whole of the context be considered with them. Besides it is plain that the Apostle does not allow of an intermediate reservation of the soul somewhere by itself till the body is raised and joined again to it; a doctrine which has been invented to make the passages which openly speak of the immediate resurrection of the soul seem to be combinable with the doctrine of the resurrection of the body: he speaks of the raising of the spiritual body as the only resurrection, and never hints at the soul as existing separately from the spiritual body. It is necessary then to understand the whole of an immediate resurrection upon the death of the body.\*

\* Quite evident it is, that, whatever became of Elijah's material body it was not carried up into heaven: for quite evident it is, though the circumstance is generally overlooked, that the translation of Elijah was not seen by Elisha with the eyes of his body, but with those of his spirit: on which mode of vision, customary with the prophets, we shall have to offer some remarks in a subsequent Section. Elisha had asked, that a double portion of his master's spirit might be upon him; to which Elijah answered, "Thou hast asked a hard thing: nevertheless, *if thou see me* when I am taken from thee, it shall be so unto thee; but *if not*, it shall not be so." (2 Ks. ii. 10.) Elijah knew that the miraculous event about to take place would be imperceptible to any man in his natural state, and could not be beheld by Elisha, unless, by special divine favor, the sight of his spirit were opened to behold it; the granting then to Elisha of the favor of the opening of his spiritual sight, was to be to him the

And we must so understand it, unless we would place the Apostle in contradiction to himself; since it is plain,

earnest of the granting to him likewise of the other favor which he had requested. This therefore was done and is distinctly recorded. "And it came to pass, as they went on, and talked, that, behold, there appeared a chariot of fire and horses of fire, and parted them both asunder; and Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven." (Ver. 11.) Certain it is that this chariot and horses of fire did not belong to the natural world, but that they were a spiritual appearance, and, consequently, not visible to the sight of a man, unless he were put into a spiritual state proper for beholding it. That Elisha then was put into such a state, is intimated by its being immediately added, "And Elisha saw it;"—that is, saw the whole transaction,—both the fiery chariot and horses and the transit of Elijah;—"and he cried, My father, my father, the chariot of Israel, and the horsemen thereof." This vision having been granted him, his return into a natural state, in which objects belonging to the spiritual world vanished from his sight, is also marked, by its being further added, "And he saw him no more." (Ver. 12.) As then it is evident that Elisha beheld the whole transaction, not with the eyes of his body but with the eyes of his spirit, it follows, that it was the spirit only of Elijah, and not his body, which in that state he saw. Had he beheld the ascension of Elijah with his natural sight, as we behold an aeronaut ascend in a balloon, there could have been no room for the intimation, that it was by special divine favor that he was enabled to see the vision: but as there is such an intimation; as, likewise, it is certain that the chariot and horses of fire, could not, like a balloon, be beheld with the natural sight; it becomes certain that the person who was thus seen to ascend was a spiritual, not a material aeronaut,—was not the body of Elijah, but his spirit.

But is it asked, What then became of his body? Suppose we ask in return, If he soared through the air to heaven, considered, as this supposition requires, as a place beyond the region of the stars, what became of *the life* of his body? We know, from the experience of those who have climbed lofty mountains or ascended in balloons, that the air becomes so rare at the height of but a very few miles from the earth's surface as to make respiration difficult, and that, on continuing to ascend, an animated body would soon come into the state of an animal in an exhausted receiver, and must inevitably expire; and we know also, that the temperature at the same time becomes so cold, that the fluids of the body would speedily be arrested, and the animal frame become a solid mass of ice. If then it is not immediately evident what became of Elijah's body, it is sufficiently evident what became of the life of it; and if we still suppose that it went to heaven by this route, we must suppose that it accomplished the voyage, not as an animated body, but as a corpse. But does not the Sacred Record itself indicate what became of the body, when it informs us, that the immediate agent in Elijah's removal was a *whirlwind*, or, according to the more extensive signification of the original expression, a *violent storm*? We read in Ps. lxxxiii. 14, 15; "As the fire burneth the wood and as the flame setteth the mountains on fire; so persecute them with thy tempest, and make them afraid with thy storm;" where the word in the original for



from other passages, that he expected such an immediate resurrection, and that in a real but spiritual body, as soon as he should be removed from the world by death. This, therefore, we will now proceed to shew.

We find him speaking to the Philippians in these decided terms, "For me, to live is Christ, and to die is gain."\* How could death be *gain* to him, if he expected to slumber in the grave for no one knows how many ages? for we have just seen that he had no idea of the existence of the soul separate from its spiritual and only resuscitative body. He adds, "For I am in a strait between two; having a desire to depart and *be with Christ*, which is far better."† Here it is plain enough that he expected an immediate resurrection, and to be then in the enjoyment of eternal happiness; from which he certainly would never wish to come to dispute the possession

*storm* is the same as is here rendered *a whirlwind*; and where an action is ascribed to it like that of fire and flame: Are we not then to infer, that it includes the action of lightning as well as of wind,—the extreme of commotion or agitation (which is the radical idea of the word) in all the elements,—all, in short, to which we usually apply the word *storm*? Place then any man in the very centre of such a commotion of the elements as we sometimes behold; thus expose him to the action of the electric or galvanic fluid in its utmost energy;—and any philosopher will inform us, not only that his body would be instantly deprived of its life, or that it would be torn to atoms,—for this would be the result of a comparatively slight action of that mighty solvent,—but that it would be completely decomposed and resolved into its elements. When therefore the Scripture informs us, (ver. 1,) that "the Lord would take up Elijah into heaven by a whirlwind or storm;" and afterwards (ver. 11) that he did so; it tells us, by a euphuism, that Elijah died; as Aaron and Moses, also by divine appointment, each went up into a mountain to die; (Num. xx. 25, &c. Deut. xxxii. 49, &c.); and it sufficiently explains why his body could not afterwards be found.

The soul and the body, in the spiritual sense, are the internal and external man. The life of the external man by birth is in opposition to heavenly life, and consists in mere lusts or concupiscences; wherefore this life is to be relinquished or extinguished; which is effected by means of temptations. They who kill the body, then, are the temptations, and the tempting powers, by whose agency the life of the external man, or the life of man's lusts, is extinguished: and he who hath power to cast soul and body into hell, is the love of evil, which is opposition to the Lord, pertinaciously cherished, and which causes the Lord himself to appear as in opposition to man; the consequence of which is, the destruction both of the internal and the external man, and immersion in endless misery.

\* Chap. i. 21.

† Ver. 23.



of his body with the worms, and collect again the dust which once served him for a body upon earth.

But that he fully expected to enter upon his eternal inheritance immediately on death, and then to be clothed with his immortal body, is indisputable, when we attend to what he says to the Corinthians in his second epistle. After having remarked that our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory:”\* he goes on to shew that this is to be entered upon as soon as our earthly body dies, saying, “For we know, that if our earthly tabernacle were dissolved,” (no person I suppose will dispute that our earthly tabernacle is the body in which we live on earth:—so soon then as this is dissolved) “we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens:”†—consequently by this house in the heavens, as opposed to the earthly tabernacle of the natural body, he means the spiritual body, in which dwells the soul of the faithful after death. “For in this,” he adds, “we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so be that, being clothed, we shall not be found naked.”‡ Here by being clothed upon by the house from heaven, he must mean, to appear in such a body as is enjoyed by the angels, which is the image of the divine graces that adorn their minds, and which is formed such while man lives in the world, according as those graces find an abiding place in him: and by being found naked, he means, to be, indeed, in a spiritual body, as being stripped of the natural body, but in such a one as cannot appear in heaven, being the form and image of all our natural corruptions, of which nakedness and shame are constantly predicated in the language of inspiration. He adds, “For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being, burdened: not for that we would be unclothed,”—that is, not forwardly desiring to die,—“but clothed upon,”—invested with a truly heavenly as well as spiritual form,—“that mortality might be swallowed up of life.”§ It is plain, then, that he expected such a glorious investment to take place, with the faithful, immediately after death; accordingly, he adds presently, “Therefore we are always confident,

\* Ch. iv. 17.

† Ch. v. 1.

‡ Ver. 2, 3.

§ Ver. 4.

knowing that, while we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord;—we are confident, I say, willing rather *to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord.*”\* Here then we find, that, with the faithful, when the earthly tabernacle is put off, the heavenly one is put on, and that as soon as they are absent from the body they are present with the Lord,—that is, immediately after death. Carrying on therefore the same ideas, he proceeds to shew, that every one in particular is judged also immediately after death, without waiting to come back to take the material body for the purpose: thus he immediately adds, “Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him. For we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in the body,” (mind that,—done *in the body, though that is now put off,*) “according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.” Who can read these words, and suppose that the Apostle had any idea of coming back again to resume his dead body, before he was thus to “appear before the judgment-seat of Christ?” Or who can imagine, that, after having had his doom decided “before the judgment-seat of Christ,” he expected to be sent back again to re-animate his body of dust? Evidently then the Apostle believed, that when once he had laid this down, he had done with it for ever; and was well satisfied with the expectation of entering, instead of it, into the sensible possession of his spiritual body,—of his “house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.” In the same manner, he intimately connects together death and judgment elsewhere: “It is appointed unto all men once to die, but after this the judgment:”† on which the pious Watts judiciously remarks, “whether immediate or more distant is not here expressly declared; though the immediate connexion of the words *hardly gives room for seventeen hundred years to intervene.*”‡

We have before seen, that the passages in the writing of the Apostle Paul which are commonly cited in proof of the resurrection of the material body, in reality prove no such doctrine, but the contrary; and that the few expressions which *might* be understood as applying to a

\* Ver. 6, 8, † Heb. ix. 27. ‡ Works, Leeds Ed. vol. vii. p. 7.

resurrection at some distant period, by no means *require* such an interpretation ; We have now seen, that to put such an interpretation upon them is to make the Apostle contradict himself ; for that his doctrine unequivocally is, that man rises again immediately after death ;—that as soon as his “ earthly house,” or material body, is dissolved, the good man is clothed with a spiritual body of celestial origin, “ a house from heaven ;” while the wicked man is “ found naked,” having a spiritual body indeed, but not of heavenly origin, and all the deformity and shame of which is discovered when divested of its outer clothing of clay ;—that a particular judgment is then immediately passed on all, for all then “ appear before the judgment-seat of Christ ;” —and that the good, being then “ absent from the body” and “ present with the Lord,” immediately have their “ light affliction, which is but for a moment,” recompensed with “ a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.” Thus when the whole of his testimony is brought together, is not this Apostle a most decided preacher of the doctrine, upon this subject, which we offer as that of the New Jerusalem ?

As these are the sentiments of the Apostle Paul, so also are they those of his Divine Master. In opening the subject above, I adduced one or two of the explicit declarations in which the Lord Jesus Christ propounds the doctrine of an immediate resurrection ; I will here add one or two more of his statements to that effect.

What then can be more decisive than the Lord’s declaration from the cross to the penitent thief ; “ Verily I say unto thee, *To-day* shalt thou be with me in paradise ?” \* I know what pains have been taken to evade this declaration, by explaining *paradise* to be, not heaven, or the final state of blessedness, but merely a happy part of the intermediate region called *Hades*, in which it is supposed that the soul is to wait for its re-union with the body. But certain it is, from another remarkable place in which the word *paradise* occurs, (where also, as here, it comes from the mouth of the Lord Jesus Christ,) that it is employed to express man’s final and highest state of bliss ; for it is said, “ To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree

\* Luke xxiii. 43.

of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God.”\* Can any suppose, that the reward here promised to the victor in spiritual conflicts is only a comfortable situation in the intermediate state called *Hades*? Does it not evidently refer to his final happiness in heaven? Then, certainly, when the Lord Jesus Christ says to the penitent, “To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise,” he promises him an immediate admission into his final state of happiness: consequently, as he did not, then, take his material body thither, it is inconsistent with this promise to suppose, that the final state of happiness is not to be enjoyed without the resumption of the material body.

But the parable of the rich man and Lazarus is so positive, that it, alone, is amply sufficient to establish the fact of man’s resurrection, in a spiritual but substantial body, with capacities for the fullest sense of either happiness or misery, either delight or punishment, immediately after death. “The beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham’s bosom: The rich man also died and was buried. And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue; for I am tormented in this flame. And Abraham said,” &c.† Here all parties are spoken of as being still men, and as having the members and functions of men. Notice is taken of Abraham’s *bosom*, of the rich man’s *tongue*, and of Lazarus’s *finger*. Abraham and the rich man hold a conversation. The rich man is represented as suffering the extreme of torment, and Abraham and Lazarus as enjoying perfect happiness. And all this is described as occurring immediately on the death of the rich man and Lazarus; to place which beyond all doubt,—to prevent the possibility of supposing that the narrative relates to a state which they were to experience after resuming their bodies,—the rich man is made to speak of his brethren *still living in the natural world*.‡ No one, I suppose, will have the hardihood to say, that as the whole is a parable, and the rich man and Lazarus are fictitious characters, we

\* Rev. ii. 7.

† Luke xvi. 22, to the end.

‡ Ver. 28.



must not apply what is said of them to real persons deceased: for it is evident, though the rich man and Lazarus are imaginary persons, that they are representatives of whole classes of real persons, and that what is said of them is intended to make us acquainted with the real state of multitudes. Indeed, it is obvious, that the main design of the parable is, to communicate information respecting the real state of certain classes of good and wicked persons after death. The information it communicates is, that man no sooner leaves this world by death, than he finds himself living as a man complete in another, with capacities for the most acute sensibility either to delight or misery; and further, that a particular judgment takes place upon man immediately after death. And, were it true that the material body is to have its resurrection also, it is impossible to conceive that the Divine Speaker would deliver a parable from which every one would infer such resurrection to be needless, without introducing some precautionary words to prevent the mistake. No such precautionary words occur. While the immediate resuscitation of all that makes man a man is decisively asserted, no allusion is made to any resuscitation of that extrinsic adjunct to the man, his material body. Who then but must conclude, from this divine relation, that his material body is never to be attached to him again?

I will close this part of the subject with another observation on a passage slightly noticed above, the Lord's answer to the Sadducees; the precise force of which seems generally to have been overlooked. He finishes the debate with them by saying, "Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living."\* As the learned Hody, whose candor I have before had occasion to commend, here remarks,† "The most that this argument proves, is the immortality of the soul,—that the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, did not die with their bodies, as the Sadducees believed."

\* Mat'. xxii. 31, 32.

† In his "Resurrection of the Same Body Asserted." He was the author of the celebrated work, "*De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus.*"



But let it be well observed, that the question in debate between the Lord Jesus Christ and the Sadducees was, *the resurrection*. It is introduced by the statement, "The same day, came to him the Sadducees, which say there is no *resurrection*."\* They conclude their inquiry respecting the woman who had had seven husbands, by asking, "Therefore *in the resurrection*, whose wife shall she be of the seven?"† As the question had thus been put respecting *the resurrection*, it is respecting *the resurrection* that Jesus shapes his answers: "In *the resurrection*," he says "they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven."‡ And finally, to make his answer as full and decisive as possible, and to clear his meaning from all ambiguity, he applies his argument respecting the continued existence of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to prove, not, simply, *the resurrection*, but, explicitly, *the resurrection of the dead*: for thus he introduces it: "But as touching *the resurrection of the dead*; have ye not read," &c.§ How is this to be evaded? Jesus proves *the resurrection of the dead*, by proving, that *the spirits* of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were then living: Is not this completely demonstrative, that, in the idea of its Divine Author, the phrase, *the resurrection of the dead*, has no reference whatever to a *resuscitation of dead bodies*,—that the only resurrection of the dead ever to be experienced by man, is that of which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, have long since been the subjects? And must we not everywhere understand the phrase in the same sense as is here undeniably given it by the Lord Jesus Christ himself?

I may now, I humbly hope, appeal to all the Reflecting, and ask, Whether the doctrine which they who humbly trust that they belong to the New Church of the Lord, signified, in the Revelation, by the New Jerusalem, hold upon the subject of the Resurrection, is not that of the whole Bible? We have found, upon an extensive review of the passages commonly relied on for the proof of the resurrection of the body, that not one of them affords any real countenance to such a notion, but that many of them prove decidedly the reverse: we have found that the passages which assert man's imme-

\* Ver. 23.

† Ver. 28.

‡ Ver. 30.

§ Ver. 31.

diate resurrection, and which assign to him, in the resurrection, a spiritual body, in which he exists as a real substantial man, and becomes a subject either of final happiness or misery, are numerous, unequivocal, and perfectly conclusive: and, finally, we have ascertained, that the phrase, *the resurrection of the dead*, means such a resurrection as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, experienced immediately after death. Thus the doctrine of the Scriptures upon this momentous subject is clearly that which we have embraced, as the doctrine of the New Jerusalem: if then the Scriptures are to decide the question, it appears to us, that our doctrine upon this subject is impreguably established.

Let us now ask, by way of conclusion, which doctrine has most moral advantages,—which is most likely to have a beneficial effect on the life and practice;—that which defers man's final happiness or misery to an indefinite distance, and represents him as without capacities for the complete sense of either, till he again becomes a man by the resumption of his dust, after a lapse of still, probably, many, many ages, whilst, during the intermediate period, he is a mere breath or vapor, or something still less substantial, differing but little from a non-entity;—or that which regards him as rising again, a perfect man, as soon as he quits his clay, possessing far keener powers of perceiving either happiness or misery than he had while shrouded over with flesh, and going to meet his final doom at once? No one, I should think, can hesitate a moment about the answer: but lest I, in giving it, should be suspected of being under the influence of prejudice, the amiable Watts shall be the respondent. “So corrupt,” says he, “and perverse are the inclinations of men in this fallen and degenerate world, and their passions are so much impressed and moved by things that are present, or just at hand, that the joys of heaven, and the sorrows of hell, when set far beyond death and the grave, at some vast and unknown distance of time, would have but too little influence on their hearts and lives. And although these solemn and important events are never so certain in themselves, yet being looked on as things a great way off, they make too feeble an impression on the conscience, and their distance is much abused to give an indulgence to present sensualities. For this we have the testimony of

our blessed Saviour himself (Matt. xxiv. 48:) ‘The evil servant says, *My Lord delayeth his coming; then he begins to smite his fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken.*’ And Solomon teaches the same truth (Eccl. viii. 11:) ‘*Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the heart of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil.*’ And even the good servants, in this imperfect state, the sons of virtue and piety, may be too much allured to indulge sinful negligence, and yield to temptations too easily, when the terrors of another world are set so far off, and their hope of happiness is delayed so long.—Whereas, *if it can be made to appear from the Word of God, that, AT THE MOMENT OF DEATH, the soul enters into AN UNCHANGEABLE STATE according to its character and conduct here on earth, and that the recompenses of vice and virtue are to begin immediately upon the end of our state of trial;*—then all those little subterfuges are precluded, which mankind would form to themselves from the unknown distance of the day of recompense. Virtue will have a nearer and stronger guard placed about it, and piety will be attended with superior motives, if its rewards are near at hand, and shall commence, as soon as this life expires; and the vicious and profane will be more effectually affrighted, if the hour of death must immediately consign them to a state of perpetual sorrows and bitter anguish.” He then notices the argument, that the dead will awake out of their graves utterly ignorant of the long time that has past since their death, wherefore men should be as careful to prepare for judgment as if they were immediately to undergo it: to which he replies, “I grant, men should be so in all reason and justice. But such is the weakness and folly of our natures, that *men will not be so much influenced, and alarmed, by distant prospects, nor so solicitous to prepare for an event which they suppose to be so very far off, as they would FOR THE SAME EVENT, if it commences as soon as ever this mortal life expires.* The vicious man will indulge his sensualities, and lie down to sleep in death, with this comfort: ‘I shall take my rest here for a hundred or a thousand years [or no one knows how much longer;] and, perhaps, in all that space, my offences may be forgotten; or something may happen that I may escape; or, let the worst come that can come, I shall have a long sweet nap before my sorrows begin.’

Thus *the force of divine terrors is greatly enervated by this delay of punishment.*"\*

Who can be insensible to the power of these weighty considerations? And if they could be so strongly felt by a writer, who believed, nevertheless, that the body is at last to be raised again, and that all that is to be enjoyed or suffered in the meantime is but a faint foretaste of what is to be experienced afterwards; how truly cogent do the arguments become when relieved by this neutralizing drawback,—when it is seen that the spirit of man is truly the man himself, possessing sensations immensely more acute than any that can be imparted to flesh and blood,—and when it thus is known that all the fulness either of joy or sorrow which is commonly supposed to follow only upon the resurrection of the body, awaits the man as soon as he enters the eternal world by death! Then the arguments of the heavenly-minded Watts become powerful indeed. It is only in connexion with *our* view of the resurrection that they possess their proper weight. May we not then say, that whoever wishes to see the practice of virtue enforced, and that of vice discouraged, by the strongest of all possible sanctions, must wish to see the truth of the New-Jerusalem-doctrine of the Resurrection cordially acknowledged by all mankind?

---

## SECTION IV.

### *The Last Judgment.*

I now have to appeal to you, my Reflecting Readers, upon the subject of the Last Judgment. The views which we believe to be those of the New Jerusalem of the Apocalypse in regard to this great consummation, differ considerably, it is true, from those commonly entertained: and they also are such as, when first propounded, universally excite no small degree of surprise: yet

\* Works, Ed. Leeds, Vol. vii. p. 5, 6, 7.



their truth appears to be by no means difficult of proof; and I trust that it has already, in some degree, become apparent.

Respecting the General Judgment our distinguishing opinions are these two: First, that, according to the Scriptures, the scene of it was to be, not in the natural world, as commonly believed, but in the spiritual: and, Secondly, that it has there been accomplished accordingly. Of these two propositions, the first may already have been sufficiently proved: for if it has been proved, as attempted in the last Section, that man rises from the dead, in a spiritual body, immediately on the death of the material body, and that no resurrection of the material body will ever take place, it necessarily follows, that the spiritual world, into which death introduces him, can alone be the scene of the judgment he is to experience. But, as what passes in the spiritual world cannot be known to the inhabitants of the natural world in general, if performed there, the inhabitants of the natural world would not have any consciousness of what was passing. Hence our second proposition, that it has there been accomplished accordingly,—affirms nothing that is at all improbable in itself, and nothing which can, by any possibility, be proved to be false. We will first give further evidence in proof of our first proposition; after which we shall see, that, independently of the assertions of Swedenborg, there are various considerations tending to evince, that our second, also, is certainly true.

But as the Rev. Mr Beaumont has devoted a Section of his *Anti-Swedenborg* to the subject of the Last Judgment, I must, agreeably to the plan of this Appeal, take some notice of his observations. As, however, he has here aimed more at misrepresenting than at refuting our sentiments, he offers nothing in the way either of argument or of evidence that need detain us long.

Among the arts too often resorted to by polemic writers, it has been observed that this is one. The controvertist selects some doctrine of great importance which no one ever thought of denying; he proves with great display of authorities the certainty of such doctrine; he insinuates that its truth is denied by those whose sentiments it is wished to render odious; and then, because, he has clearly proved what nobody doubts, he triumphs as if he had completely defeated the object of his attack.



This is the course frequently adopted by assailants of the New Church, and, among the rest, by the author of the Anti-Swedenborg. As if we denied the last judgment altogether, he introduces the subject with these remarks: "The doctrine of the Last Judgment is of high import, and is most clearly revealed in the Word of God. Nor has there ever been much controversy in the Christian world on this subject; which is a clear proof, if more than Scripture proof were wanting, that the doctrine has met with the acquiescence of all men throughout the Christian world, with the exception, now of late, of the Swedenborgians, who, I suppose, wish to be called Christians." Accordingly, to put down these wicked Swedenborgians, a great display of texts is made in which a judgment is asserted. These are mostly taken, as they ought to be, from the Bible; but the first and longest of them is extracted from the "Mahometan's Creed;" as if, on this subject, the Bible and the Koran were of equal authority! The ancient heathens, also, are brought in to condemn us. "Many," says Mr B., "of the wiser heathens believed in a general judgment in some form; though their *form* might differ from that recorded in the Scripture, yet the *thing* they believed. For they could in no wise reconcile themselves to the prosperity of the vicious, and the adversity of the virtuous, which was every day before their eyes, but on the supposition of a future reckoning day, and an hereafter of rewards and punishments."\* Now to what purpose is all this, when it never entered into the thoughts of one of those persons whom he calls Swedenborgians, to have any shadow of doubt about the reality of "a future reckoning day, and a hereafter of rewards and punishments?" If the heathens are to be commended, because they "believed in a general judgment in some form, though their form might differ from that recorded in the Scriptures," are we to be censured, because we believe in a general judgment in the form recorded in the Scriptures, though our form may differ from that preferred by Mr Beaumont? And because the form of the general judgment believed in by us, and taken by us from the Scriptures, differs from that preferred by Mr Beaumont, are the heathens to be called in to condemn us, as if, worse than they, we de-

\* P. 54.

nied both the form and the thing? If, in the above paragraph, our accuser did not mean to insinuate this, he meant nothing, and wrote what was as irrelevant to his own design as it is to our sentiments. Indeed, scarcely anything that he has said in this part of his work applies to our views in any degree whatever. Our doctrines affirm, that a particular judgment takes place, on every individual, at death: he then who wishes to overthrow them, ought to prove from Scripture, that no one undergoes any particular judgment after death whatever. Our doctrines affirm, that the general judgment mentioned in Scripture was to take place in the spiritual world and not in the natural, and that, agreeably to divine prediction, it has there been performed accordingly: he then who would overthrow them should prove, that the general judgment was not to take place in the spiritual world, but in the natural, and that it will not be performed till the total end and destruction of the world. None of these points has our opponent attempted to establish: as then all that he has said upon the subject is entirely beside the question, I shall proceed to deliver our sentiments respecting it without further noticing either his arguments or his texts. All that he has advanced respecting it we fully admit, except his Mahometan proof, and his misrepresentations of our views.\*

\* I here subjoin, with a remark or two to shew their inadequacy to the object, the few sentences in which Mr Beaumont makes any attempt to encounter our sentiments.

After the paragraph respecting the acknowledgment by the heathens of "a future reckoning day and a hereafter of rewards and punishments," he adds, (p. 54, 55), "But I must not wrong the Swedenborgians, for they allow of a judgment; but it is a judgment on every individual soon after leaving the *material* body, and takes place in the spiritual world!" In connexion with what had gone before and marked, as it is, by the note of exclamation, this must be intended to treat such a mode of "allowing of a judgment" as nugatory and evasive,—as if it were no judgment at all: What man however, of sound mind but must feel, that "a judgment on every individual soon after leaving the material body," is, to every individual, an incomparably more serious affair, than a judgment to take place many hundreds or thousands of years hence? Mr B. proceeds: "If it be true, as some learned men say, that, in the whole world, more than sixty persons die every minute, one minute with another; then there can be no cessation to the work of judgment!" Another eloquent note of admiration, to call upon the reader to supply by his imagination the objection, which, the author saw, would appear utterly futile if plainly stated. For what can be the design of this sentence,

I. The first proposition then that I am to endeavor to establish, is, That the General Judgment announc-

with its note of admiration, but to hint, that the Divine Judge would find such a mode of judgment too troublesome and difficult? If my dulness of apprehension causes me to do our assailant any injustice, I beg his pardon; but if this be not the meaning of the sentence, it appears to me to have no meaning at all, but to be the merest nonsense; and whether such a meaning will raise it much above nonsense, the reader must determine. The objector insinuates, that to judge of the cases of sixty persons in a minute, is too hard for Omniscience; wherefore, to simplify the matter, he would have all who have died from the beginning of the world to the end of it judged at once. He goes on: "And if that be true also, which a zealous Swedenborgian once told me, that according to their doctrine the world will never be at an end, but will last for ever, then there must be an everlasting propagation of mankind." This is a sad aggravation of the difficulty, indeed. If the human race is thus to continue, and the ratio of its increase goes on as at present, instead of only sixty dying in a minute, there will at length be six hundred, or six thousand; and then how can they be judged? The mind of the objector is overwhelmed at the thought; and he apprehends that the Almighty must sink under the task, as he does under the idea. Can he really mean to suggest that "the everlasting propagation of mankind" is too much for Infinity? Can he in fact suppose, that Infinity can be satisfied with less? Can he behold the countless multitude of suns which the telescope discovers to us, each accompanied, as reason necessarily concludes, with its dependent worlds; can he admit that all these are replenished with inhabitants, and with an endless variety of natural productions, like the world in which we live; can he believe that the minutest and the greatest of all things are alike the workmanship of the Creator; and that his providence, throughout all worlds, is as universal as the Lord teaches when he says, that not a sparrow falls to the ground without our heavenly Father, and that the very hairs of our head are all numbered? Can his mind embrace all this, and then shrink from the congenial idea, that He who has produced and who governs these mighty works, did not create them for the sake of uncreating them again, but, as they are boundless in extent, so are they intended to be in duration, and their Creator will continue to draft off from them inhabitants for his heavenly kingdom, in continually increasing numbers, without end? Alas, this thought seems to distress our poor friend most of all; for he adds, as something transcendentally monstrous, "And then again, according to this New Jerusalem doctrine, all mankind after death become either angels in heaven or devils in hell; wherefore, it clearly follows that this world, their doctrine being admitted, is nothing but a manufactory of angels and devils!" Most truly, it does so follow: and if the inference thus sagaciously brought out is sufficient to condemn the "New Jerusalem doctrine," we have not a syllable to offer in extenuation. If Mr B. will have it so, "this world is nothing but a manufactory of angles and devils." And pray, for what "manufactory," more worthy of its Creator than that of angels, does he think it can be designed? (as for devils, he knows that, according to our doctrines, they are not *manufactured* such by the

ed in Scripture, as to be performed at the Second Coming of the Lord, was not to take place in the natural world, as commonly supposed, but in the spiritual.

That it was not to take place in the natural world, is evident from this consideration: that the circumstances announced in prophecy as being to attend it, are such as cannot be intended to be literally understood, and, some of them, such as are impossible in the nature of things.

For what is the nature of the Last Judgment, according to the common apprehensions of it; and how is it to be performed? We have all been told from our childhood, that angels are to appear with trumpets, the sound of which shall be so loud, as not only to rouse to a sense of the great event at hand the whole race of mankind then living upon the globe, but also to wake the dead: for then

“——a mighty trump, one half concealed  
In clouds, one half to mortal eye revealed,  
Shall pour a dreadful note; the piercing call  
Shall rattle in the centre of the ball,  
The extended circuit of creation shake;  
The living die with fear, the dead awake.”\*

Or, as another poet describes it,

“Celestial guards the topmost height attend,  
And crowds of angels down from heaven descend;  
With their big cheeks the deafening clarions wind,  
Whose dreadful clangors startle all mankind:—  
Ten thousand worlds revive to better skies,  
And from their tombs the thronging corpses rise.”†

No matter how long since they may have lain mouldering in the dust, nor how widely their particles may have been scattered asunder; no matter into what other substances they may have passed; nor even though, by being devoured by cannibals, or by passing into the substances of vegetables and animals, and being thence again taken into the human system, they may have formed parts

Creator, but by themselves.) Does he mean to deny the fact, and affirm that mankind do not become either angels or devils? It really is not easy to tell what he means; further than this; that he is determined, at any rate, to contradict the doctrines of the New Jerusalem, but cannot find anything plausible to urge against them. The plain English of such objections is this,—that those sublime and heavenly doctrines make God too wise, too good, and too great.

\* Young.

† Amhurst's translation of Addison's celebrated Latin poem on the Altar-piece of Magdalen College, Oxford.



of human bodies many times over; no matter for these and a thousand difficulties more, all shall revive:

“ And now, from every corner of the earth,  
The scattered dust is called to second birth;  
Whether in mines it formed the ripening mass,  
Or humbly mixed and flourished in the grass,  
[Or holds the station that it held before,  
In human forms incorporate o’er and o’er.]  
The severed body now unites again,  
And kindred atoms rally into men —  
Here an imperfect form returns to light,  
Not half renewed, dishonest to the sight;  
Maimed of his nose appears his blotted face,  
And scarce the image of a man we trace:  
Here, by degrees infused, the vital ray  
Gives the first motion to the panting clay:  
Slow, to new life the thawing fluids creep,  
And the stiff joints wake heavily from sleep.”\*

This description, to be sure, exposes a little of the inconveniences of the operation; however, all shall be made complete,

“——not the least atom  
Embezzled or mislaid of the whole tale.  
Each soul shall have a body ready-furnished;  
And each shall have his own.”†

The whole terraqueous globe; it seems, like one huge mine, is suddenly to explode, and every spot, both of earth and sea, is to shoot out a human body:

“ So when famed Cadmus sowed the fruitful field,  
With pregnant throes the quickened furrow swell’d,  
From the warm soil sprung up a warlike train,  
And human harvests covered all the plain.”‡

These, however, though they appear as men complete, are as yet only men’s bodies: the souls, therefore, which formerly animated them, and which have been reserved in some unknown region, are to be called from their obscure and not very comfortable retreat, and united with them again:

“ The body thus renewed, the conscious soul,  
Which has, perhaps, been fluttering near the pole,

\* Amburst’s Addison.

† Blair. Well may the poet add,  
“ Ask not how this shall be.”—

And well may both poet and dogmatist seek to silence inquiry with the magic word “ Omnipotence.”

‡ Amhurst’s Addison.



Or midst the burning planets wondering strayed,  
 Or hovered o'er where her pale corpse was laid;  
 Or rather coasted on her final state,  
 And feared, or wished, for her appointed fate;  
 This soul, returning with a constant flame,  
 Now weds for ever her immortal frame."\*

And notwithstanding the multitude of spirits and bodies thus seeking for each other, they shall all find their own,

"Nor shall the conscious soul  
 Mistake its partner; but amidst the crowd,  
 Singling its other half, into its arms  
 Shall rush, with all the impatience of a man  
 That's new come home, who having long been absent,  
 With haste runs over every different room,  
 In pain to see the whole."†

These then are all to join those who may then be living, and, forming with them an innumerably great army, are to wait the decision of their lot. To continue our poetical selections:

"Ten thousand trumpets now at once advance;  
 Now deepest silence lulls the vast expanse:  
 So deep the silence, and so loud the blast,  
 As Nature died when she had groaned her last.  
 Nor man nor angel moves. The Judge on high  
 Looks round, and with his glory fills the sky:  
 Then on the fatal book his hand he lays,  
 Which high to view supporting seraphs raise:  
 In solemn form the rituals are prepared,  
 The seal is broken, and a groan is heard.—  
 Aloft, the seats of bliss their pomp display,  
 Brighter than brightness, this distinguished day:  
 Horrors beneath, darkness in darkness, hell  
 Of hell, where torments behind torments dwell;  
 A furnace formidable, deep, and wide,  
 O'erboiling with a mad sulphureous tide,  
 Expands its jaws, most dreadful to survey,  
 And roars outrageous for the destined prey.—  
 Such is the scene: and one short moment's space  
 Concludes the hopes and fears of human race."‡

While this is proceeding, all the elements sympathize: the world takes fire; the stars fall to the earth; and at length all creation perishes in one universal conflagration:

"Reverse all Nature's web shall run,  
 And spotless Misrule, all around,  
 Order, its flying foe, confound,  
 While backward all the threads shall haste to be unspun."

\* Young.

† Blair.

‡ Young.

“ The sun, by sympathy concerned,  
 At these convulsions, pangs, and agonies,  
 Which on the whole creation seize,  
 Is to substantial darkness turned.  
 The neighboring moon, as if a purple flood  
 O'erflowed her tottering orb, appears  
 Like a huge mass of black corrupting blood ;  
 For she herself a dissolution fears.”

“ No more the stars, with paler beams,  
 Shall tremble o'er the midnight streams,  
 But travel downward, to behold  
 What mimics them so twinkling there ;  
 And, like Narcissus, as they gain more near,  
 For the loved image straight expire,  
 And agonize in warm desire,  
 Or slake their heat as in the stream they roll.  
 Whilst the World burns, and all the orbs below  
 In their expiring ruins glow,  
 They sink, and unsupported leave the skies,  
 Which fall abrupt, and tell their torment in their noise.”\*

“ This globe, alone, would but defraud the fire,  
 Starve its devouring rage : the flakes aspire  
 And catch the clouds ; and make the heavens their prey :  
 The sun, the moon, the stars, all melt away :  
 All, all is lost : no monument, no sign,  
 Where once so proudly blazed the gay machine.  
 So bubbles on the foaming stream expire ;  
 So sparks that scatter from the kindling fire.  
 The devastations of one dreadful hour  
 The great Creator's six-days' work devour.”†

It is thus that the Last Judgment is usually described. I have taken my delineation of it from the poets, because it is to poetry that such ideas properly appertain: I have been careful, however, not to borrow from them any circumstances of their own invention, but only such as, whether related in poetry or in prose, are generally believed to belong to the subject; and it would be easy to repeat all their statements from almost every prose-writer who has handled the theme. Of the poets, also, whom I have cited, three were clergymen, whose orthodoxy has never been disputed; and the fourth (Addison), is an author, whose authority, on such a subject, few of the clergy would reject. But who can weigh, in the balance of a cool deliberate judgment, such representations as the above, without concluding, that the facts affirmed in them are as purely poetical as the language?—in other

\* Pomfret.

† Young.

words, that the facts are pure figures, bearing, indeed, a distinct signification,—relating to circumstances which were infallibly to come to pass,—but the true nature of which must be totally mistaken while the figurative language in which they are described is literally understood? The facts are all taken from the prophetic language of Scripture: they are the figures of inspired prophecy transferred into the works of uninspired writers: and who can seriously consider them, and advert to the manifold inconsistencies which the literal adherence to them includes, as unconsciously drawn out and dwelt upon by the writers of the above quotations, without acceding to the assertion of the illustrious Swedenborg, That men have formed such notions respecting the last judgment, merely because the genuine spiritual sense of the Holy Word has not heretofore been known, and the language in which it is written, which is that of the perpetual analogy or correspondence established by the Creator between spiritual things and natural, has not been understood?\* But why abide by the letter here, when many things are affirmed in prophecy, in connexion with the above, which are never literally interpreted? no one, for instance, ever yet dreamed, that, at the time of the Last Judgment, or preparatory to it, a dragon would be seen falling from heaven, a woman in labor clothed with the sun, and a beast with seven heads and ten horns ascending out of the sea, while another with two lamb's horns rises out of the earth, as described in chs. xii. and xiii. of the Revelation: and yet it were just as reasonable to expect these phænomena then to take place, as to expect all dead carcasses to leave their graves; the Divine Judge to appear visibly in the clouds, seated on a throne there placed, with books open before him; the sun and moon to be extinguished, and the stars to fall from heaven; and the earth and visible heavens, thus the whole visible universe, to be consumed with fire. The latter are all symbolic images as well as the former, and are only to be understood by the same rule of interpretation. In the spiritual world, indeed, where, as we shall see in the sequel, all the natural objects that

\* See the masterly and profound manner in which this subject is treated by Swedenborg himself, in the first five Sections of his work *On the Last Judgment*.

are seen, are not real natural objects, but appearances of them, corresponding to the internal state and circumstances of the spirits and angels, and conveying to the minds of the beholders the ideas of which they are expressive;—there, such appearances as are described in the prophetic language of Scripture, are doubtless seen on the occasions in connexion with which they are mentioned: but in the natural world the case is quite different; and hence the circumstances mentioned respecting the Last Judgment are not in the natural world literally to take place, and some of them are such as cannot possibly be there exhibited. It will hence follow, that it is in the spiritual world, and not in the natural, that, according to the Scriptures, the Last Judgment was to be performed. The *effects* of it, indeed, must, doubtless, be felt in the natural world also, and much that is described as accompanying it must have, in the natural world, a spiritual fulfilment: but it is in the spiritual world only that *the judgment itself* could be performed; and in the spiritual world only that any of the circumstances predicated respecting it could literally occur.

We will, however, consider the common ideas of the Last Judgment a little further. The principal circumstances expected to attend it, beside the elevation of the good into heaven and the casting of the wicked into hell, are these: 1. The resurrection of all dead bodies: 2. The appearance of the Lord in the clouds: 3. The conflagration of the world, and of the whole material universe. These three things are essential to the performance of the last judgment in the manner commonly looked for: if then it can be proved that either of them will not take place, the error of the common idea of the Last Judgment is demonstrated, and it becomes certain that the natural world is not to be the scene of its performance.

The first of these circumstances, *The resurrection of all dead bodies*, is the great foundation, the essential basis, of the received doctrine of the Last Judgment. If the bodies of the dead be not to rise again, it is perfectly evident, that the judgment upon the deceased cannot be performed in the natural world. If then it has been proved in the last Section, as attempted, that there is not a single passage of Scripture which predicts any such thing as the resurrection of the body; if it has been proved that the resurrection of the Scriptures is a rising



in a spiritual body, into a spiritual world, immediately after death; if it has been proved that it is a mistake to understand the Scripture phrase, "*the resurrection of the dead,*" as if it meant the resurrection of *the body*, since Jesus Christ himself explains it to mean no other resurrection than Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, have already experienced: then, as observed above, the common mode of expecting the Last Judgment has already been proved to be unfounded. The materials of such a judgment are gone: and, to make our ideas of the subject consistent with this fact, we must transfer our expectation of the judgment to that world, into which they who are to be judged are transferred by the resurrection.

The second circumstance, *The appearance of the Divine Judge in the clouds*, is also essential to the received doctrine of the Last Judgment: for the presence, in the natural world, of the Judge, is indispensable, if the parties to be judged are there assembled. If then it has been proved in our second Section,\* as attempted, that such a personal coming of the Lord in the clouds of heaven,—that is, of the sky,—is a thing impossible; if it has been proved, that if we understand, from the literal sense of some prophecies, that he will make his advent in the clouds, we must understand, from the literal sense of another, that he will come riding on horseback, which idea every mind at once rejects as absurd;† if it has been proved that such symbolic language is intended to an-

\* See above, p. 12 and 13. For the reasons why the nature of the Lord's Second Coming, and of the Last Judgment then to be performed, has not hitherto been understood, see also above, p. 9 to 12.

† It may be remarked, in addition, that if reason be consulted on the doctrine of the appearance of the Lord in the clouds to judge all who ever lived on the earth, it will be seen to be full of manifest inconsistencies. Thus if all dead bodies are to rise, they must, as observed above, be exploded from all parts of the earth and sea. But this world is in the form of a globe, and the clouds are never more than a very few miles above its surface: Hence, the remotest star can only be visible to half the globe at a time; and the highest cloud can never be seen from more than a very small segment of the convex earth. In what part of the clouds, then, is the Judge to appear, so as to be visible to all the inhabitants of the globe, previously living and *resurrected*, at once? These and other inconsistencies seem alone sufficient to convince any one who reflects on them, that the natural world was not to be the scene of the Last Judgment.

nounce, not his coming into this world in person, but his presence in his Word of Divine Truth, imparting to the intellectual faculties of man the power of rightly understanding it, opening the clouds of the letter, and revealing the glories of its spiritual signification: then, also, the common mode of expecting the Last Judgment has already been proved to be founded in misconception. The means of executing such a judgment are taken away; and to make our ideas of the subject consistent with this fact, we must look for its performance in that world, where such a personal appearance of the Lord, and such symbolic representations as are described as attending it, are not only not impossible, but are perfectly agreeable to the laws of nature,—the nature, that is, of a spiritual world, and of spiritual existences.\*

The third circumstance, *The conflagration of the world and of the whole material universe*, belongs, in itself, less essentially than the two former to the performance of the Last Judgment in the natural world: yet it is equally necessary to the received doctrine on the subject: because the received doctrine is drawn from the prophetic language of Scripture taken in its literal sense only: and in the literal sense of those prophecies the passing away of heaven and earth, the burning of the day of the Lord as an oven, the extinction of the sun and moon and the falling from heaven of the stars, are repeatedly announced. But if it has been proved, as was likewise, in our second section, attempted, that by these phrases, accompanied also, as they frequently are, by the promise of a new heaven and a new earth, is constantly meant the dissolution or termination of one dispensation of divine things and the founding of a new one,—or “the

\* The Lord's making his Second Coming, in a spiritual manner, among the inhabitants of this world, by restoring the right apprehension of his Divine Truth, together with the life of it, and thus effecting the renovation of his church universal among men, according to the view offered in the second Section, is a consequence of his accomplishing the last Judgment in the spiritual world; and this also he accomplishes by means of his Divine Truth,—by pouring forth the influences of his Spirit of Truth in such a manner as the wicked cannot bear. Hence, as it is more particularly in his character as the Divine Truth itself that the Lord executes judgment, he is always called, on that occasion, the Son of man;—as when he says, that the Father “hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man” (John v. 27;) for, as is men-

putting an entire end to one order of things, and the commencement of a new one, either with respect to

tioned above, p. 14, and is shewn at large in my work on the Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures, the Son of man is a title assumed by the Lord in reference to his character as the Divine Truth: and that it is to his Word, which is the same thing as the Divine Truth, that judgment belongs, he himself teaches when he says, "If any man hear my words, and believe not, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him; *the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day*" (John xii. 47, 48.) Hence we see the harmony between the spiritual fulfilment of the predictions relating to his Second Coming to the inhabitants of this world, and the spiritual conjoined (in some respects) with the literal fulfilment of the same to the inhabitants of the spiritual world. That which is manifested is, in both worlds, the Divine Truth: but in the spiritual world the Divine Truth appears in person, for the performance of the judgment; and in the natural world the Divine Truth is revealed in the Word for the restoration of the church. These two things we understand to form a one, as do the sun and its light: for of the Divine Truth in the Word, and thus of the Word itself even in its literal sense, the inmost essence is the Divine Truth in person, that is, the Lord Himself; just as the sun is the inmost essence of all the light of day; and thus plenary, it is, according to our ideas, that the written Word is divinely inspired. Now any one may conceive that the Divine Truth in person can only be visible to the sight of angels and spirits, and not to the natural sight of men; though men may receive in their understandings some apprehension of the Divine Truth contained in the Word, of which the Divine Truth in person is the only Source. According to this view it will be seen, that although our doctrines deny the possibility or the Lord's visible appearance, in his Glorified Person, to men on earth, they by no means deny that his visible appearance would attend the performance of the Last Judgment. It is this appearance which is spoken of in Acts i. 10, 11; which passage at once teaches, what it is often cited to prove, that at the Lord's coming to judgment he would visibly appear, and, what is as generally overlooked, that his appearance would not be visible to the inhabitants of the world; in general. After relating the Lord's ascension in the presence of the apostles, and saying that "a cloud received him out of their sight," it is added, "And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come, *in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.*" Now if the coming of the Lord to judgment is to be *in like manner* as his ascension, it cannot be visible to the inhabitants of the natural world; *for none of the inhabitants of the natural world beheld his ascension*, except the eleven apostles; and these did not see it with the eyes of their body (see above, p. 13, 14,) but by that of their spirit; in the manner that, according to what was shewn above (p. 54, &c. note,) the ascension of Elijah was seen

particular or to general churches;" if it has been proved that some of the occasions in regard to which such convulsions of nature are announced have underiably passed by, without any such outward catastrophe resulting; if it has thus been proved that the destruction of the world and of the material universe cannot, with any degree of probability, be inferred from the use of such images in the prophetic style of Scripture: then, again, has it already been proved to be at least in the highest degree probable, that the common mode of expecting the Last Judgment is altogether erroneous. The expected consequences of such a judgment will not, we see, ensue: the world will not, as far as can be gathered from the Scriptures, be consumed; still less will the whole visible creation,—the countless stars, which we know to be other suns, each the centre to a system of earths,—be hurled into ruin, (monstrous idea!) to punish the iniquity of this little globe. Yet such must be the fact, if the judgment is to be performed, as expected, within the precincts of nature: again then are we driven out of nature to look for it, and compelled to ac-

by Elisha; hence, as Elisha beheld, together with his ascending master, a chariot and horses of fire, so did the apostles, when viewing the ascension of their Lord, behold also two angels; just as, at his transfiguration, they had seen with him Moses and Elias; all which were spiritual beings and existences, that could not possibly be beholden with the eyes of the body. "In like manner," then, the coming of the Lord in person to judgment, could not be seen by any inhabitant of the earth, unless the eyes of his spirit were miraculously opened for the purpose: thus the declaration, that he should "so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven," can only relate, in its literal sense, to his appearance to the inhabitants of the spiritual world: and thus it was them only that he was to come again to judge. For the distinct apprehension of this, it may be necessary to add, that the Lord, when his Humanity was fully glorified, ascended above all the heavens, into the highest or inmost of all things; that the scene of the judgment, as will be seen presently, is an intermediate region of the spiritual world, between heaven and hell, appropriated to the first reception of departed spirits; and that the judgment is effected by his exhibiting himself present, in a peculiar manner, in the lowest parts of heaven, in doing which he is said to descend, though he is not the less present in his supreme residence than before. For *space* in the spiritual world, which is not formed of matter, is not fixed, but is an appearance depending upon the *states* of those who are there: and in no degree can *space* limit the presence of the Omnipresent God



knowledge that the destined scene of its performance was not the natural but the spiritual world.\*

\* We have seen in the note above, p. 67, &c. that Mr Beaumont is quite appalled at the idea of the endless duration of the world, and its shocking consequence, as he seems to think it, that "then there must be an everlasting propagation of mankind." Few besides, I apprehend, will think the idea shocking, but most, on the contrary, must regard it as grand and glorious; yet many, perhaps, may feel surprised at its novelty; for the belief that the world is to be destroyed is one of the earliest prejudices with which the mind is imbued; and few ever think of afterwards calling it under the scrutiny of the maturer judgment. Yet the future perpetual duration of the world appears to admit of proof, from reason and Scripture, that falls little short of demonstration: a sketch of some parts of the evidence shall be here subjoined.

It has been shewn in the note above, p. 16, &c. that the passages of Scripture which seem to speak of the destruction of the world, cannot have any such signification; and that this is now with respect to most of them, admitted by the learned in general. But the single circumstance, that the destruction of the world should be attended, as affirmed in most of the prophecies which appear to speak of it, with the falling of the stars from heaven, seems alone sufficient to convince the reader, that the dissolution of nature is not the thing intended. This idea evidently treats the stars as if they were in reality, what they appear to the unassisted senses, mere subordinate appendages to this globe of ours, performing no other use in the creation than that which they perform to us. The Scriptures assume this idea, not for the purpose of affirming it to be the fact, but because this is sufficient to be the basis of that spiritual instruction which alone the Scriptures have for their object, and because, when they mention the stars, the stars of the firmament are never meant: but when we rise from the seeming to the real nature of the stars of the firmament, we clearly see that it cannot be of them that the Scripture speaks, when it says the stars shall fall from heaven. They cannot fall from heaven but by coming down to the earth, as described in the verses cited above from Pomfret. Any other mode of falling might as well be called rising; since it would only be a motion from one part of the visible heavens to another, which, if it caused them to set to one hemisphere of the globe, would cause them to rise to the opposite hemisphere: accordingly, that they are to fall *to the ground*, is the idea always attached to the expression by the simple, according to whose ideas of natural things the Word of God, in its letter, is uniformly written. While the world was believed to be the largest body in the universe, around which, as their centre the sun and all the stars moved, the practicability of such a falling of the heavenly bodies might easily be imagined. But since the advancement of science has dispelled this illusion; since it is known that the earth is but a mere speck in comparison with the sun, whilst the millions of stars which the telescope discovers are other suns, all thousands of times larger than the earth; it becomes impossible to imagine for a moment, that these enormous bodies can ever come tumbling from the sky, and drop upon the surface of this atom of a

That part of our first proposition, which affirms, "that the General Judgment announced in Scripture as

globe. Certainly, then, it is impossible, when the Scripture speaks of the falling of the stars, that the stars of the firmament can be intended: consequently, the mention of such convulsions cannot be intended to affirm the destruction of the world and of the universe.

The common reader of the Scriptures takes his expectation of the world's coming to an end, in great part, from the disciples' request of the Lord, "Tell us when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming and of *the end of the world?*" (Mat. xxiv. 3.) The word, however, here translated "the world," is literally "the age," and is a term applied to express the whole continuance of any order of things. But the Lord, in his answer, uses expressions, which decidedly demonstrate, that his coming to judgment was not to be accompanied with the end of the world, but that, after the judgment, the world was to remain as stable as ever, and replenished with inhabitants. For he says, to illustrate the discrimination which would be used in the execution of the judgment, "Then two shall be in the field; the one shall be taken and the other *left*. Two women shall be grinding at the mill; the one shall be taken and the other *left*." (Ver. 40, 41.) But if the world were to perish under their feet, how could any be left? When he speaks of some who, after the judgment, should be left in the world; and left too, it appears, at their usual occupations; how can it be supposed that the world is to be destroyed? How unmeaning would it be to speak of persons being left, laboring in the field or grinding in the mill, if the world, with all its mills and fields, were to be sunk in annihilation! Nor can this proof be evaded by saying, that it only relates to those who were captured or who escaped at the siege of Jerusalem: for though some parts of the prophecy had an imperfect and typical fulfilment at the seige of Jerusalem, it is fully evident, and is generally acknowledged, that its main and final reference is to the Second Coming of the Lord and the Last Judgment: if then some of the things which had a typical fulfilment at the seige of Jerusalem were to have their final fulfilment at the time of the Last Judgment, how arbitrary and palpably forced is the interpretation, which would limit others of the same series of circumstances to the seige of Jerusalem only!

But that the biblical texts which seem to speak of the destruction of the world cannot mean any such thing, is also evident from this circumstance: that there are many others which affirm the direct contrary. These I will here subjoin, with some remarks (slightly altered), from an article furnished by me, many years ago, to "the Intellectual Repository for the New Church," Vol. i. (first series) p. 474, &c.—"One generation passeth away, and another generation cometh; but *the earth abideth for ever*' (Eccl. i. 4): 'He buildeth his sanctuary like high places, like *the earth which he hath established for ever*' (Ps. lxxviii. 69.) 'Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David: his seed shall endure *for ever*, and his throne *as the sun* before me; it shall be established *forever* as the moon' (Ps. lxxxix. 35, 36, 37) 'Who laid the foundations of *the earth, that it should not be removed for ever*' (Ps. civ. 5.)

to be performed at the Second Coming of the Lord, was not to take place in the natural world," may now, it is hoped have been proved to the satisfaction of the re-

'They that trust in the Lord shall be as *mount Zion*, which cannot be removed, but *abideth for ever*' (cxxv. 1). And in Ps. cxlviii., after calling on *all created things*, and the *sun and moon* among the rest, to praise the Lord, the inspired writer adds (ver. 6), 'He hath also *established them for ever and ever*; he hath made a decree which cannot pass.'—The eternal duration of the world is as expressly asserted in these passages, as its destruction is in any others: thus the Scripture, in its literal sense, proves both sides of the question; consequently, it does not prove either. One of the classes of passages must be intended to be understood otherwise than the letter expresses; *which*, must be decided by other considerations. We are at liberty therefore either to believe one proposition or the other, as appears most consonant to reason.—The reasons then which induce me to believe that the world will not be destroyed, but will continue to supply new inhabitants to the eternal world for ever, are principally derived from considering the true nature and attributes of the Lord our God.—The very essence of the Creator is pure Divine Love (1 John iv. 8, 16). What was the cause from which we were created? Divine Love. What was the cause from which we were redeemed? Divine Love.—When from his Divine Love the Lord created the universe, the end he proposed was, the production of a race of rational beings capable of enjoying his divine mercies, out of whom he might form an angelic heaven, in the midst of which he might himself eternally reside, and communicate an eternally increasing felicity to an eternally increasing multitude of free recipient spirits: nor does the perdition of a part by their own fault, afford any argument against the design. If then these were the ends intended by our Omnipotent Maker in the creation of the world, what sort of ends could he intend in its destruction? None but such as are as opposite to Divine Love, as destruction is opposite to creation, as death is opposite to life. To commence destroyer,—to become Apollyon,—he must change his nature, and cease to be Jehovah. He must cease to take pleasure in seeing happy subjects added to his kingdom. The streams of his godness must suddenly stop in their course. His life-giving energies must suddenly be exhausted. He must cease to be infinite in power, he must cease to be infinite in love. Judge then which sentiment does most honor to God; that which represents him as a fickle destroyer, or that which regards him as an immutable preserver. A case may indeed be imagined, in which the world would inevitably perish, without the catastrophe being at all imputable to the divine will or agency: but this could only happen by the total extinction of all remains of a church, and the extirpation of every principle of good from the hearts of men; which, rendering it impossible for the heavenly influences to find admission any longer, and wholly intercepting the connexion between the creature and the life-giving Creator, would cause the polluted race to sink in death, and the orb they inhabited to fall to nothing. But though, so long as man continues to enjoy free-will and to be able to abuse it, such a catastrophe must be admitted to be possible, yet it never can be probable, so long as all the energies of Providence are on the alert to prevent its occurrence:

flecting mind; for we have seen, as proposed, “that the circumstances announced in prophecy as being to attend it, are such as cannot be intended to be literally

and, if we may give credit to the Divine Foreknowledge, we may rest assured that, in this globe, it will never take place; much less, in the whole visible universe. For it is abundantly declared in the Word, that a glorious church shall here be finally raised up, which shall never come to an end: consequently, the globe which is to afford to this church its ultimate seat and basis, must be of equal duration.—‘In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom *which shall never be destroyed*: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, AND IT SHALL STAND FOR EVER.’ (Dan. ii. 44.)”

To this popular statement of arguments against the expected destruction of the world, I will add an extract from Swedenborg, in which he opens the deep philosophical grounds of the necessity for the world’s continuance in existence, in so clear a manner, as must, I should think, to every one who loves to look beyond the mere surface of things, afford both conviction and delight. To prove that the procreation of the human race will never cease, he lays down and illustrates these six propositions. “I. That the human race is the basis upon which heaven is founded. II. That the human race is the seminary of heaven. III. That the extent of heaven designed for angels is so immense, that it cannot be filled to eternity. IV. That they of whom heaven consists, are, as yet, respectively but few. V. That the perfection of heaven increases according to the number of its inhabitants. VI. That every divine work has respect to what is infinite and eternal.”—In illustrating the first proposition he makes these remarks:

“That the human race is the basis upon which heaven is founded, follows from this circumstance: that man was the last object created; and that which is created last, is the basis of all that precede it. Creation began from things supreme or inmost, because from what is Divine, and proceeded to things ultimate or extreme, and then it first came into subsistence. The ultimate [last or lowest] part of creation, is the natural universe, in which is the terraqueous globe with all its contents. When these works were produced, then man was created, and into him were collated all things of Divine Order from first to last: into his inmost parts were collated those things which are in the first principles of that order, and into his last [or ultimate] parts those which are in the last [or ultimate] principles of that order. Thus man was made divine order in a substantial form. Hence all things that are in or with man, are either from heaven or from the world; from heaven all things belonging to his mind, and from the world all things belonging to his body: for the things of heaven flow into his thoughts and affections, and produce them, according as themselves are received by his spirit; and the things of the world flow into his sensations and corporeal pleasures, and produce them, according as themselves are received by his body, but in an accommodated manner, according to their agreement with the thoughts and affections of his spirit.—Such being the order of creation, it may be evident, that there is such an inseparable con-



understood, and, some of them, such as are impossible in the nature of things." The other part of the proposition, "that it was to be performed in the spiritual world," follows then of course, as also has been seen. This however may be confirmed by other considerations.

What then if it should be true, that although the General Judgment predicted in the New Testament is properly called the Last Judgment, because it is the last General Judgment ever to be performed on the natives of this earth, it is not the first such Judgment ever performed (as, indeed its very name seems to imply;) but,

nexion of all things belonging to that order, from the first to the last, that, viewed together, they constitute a one, in which that which is prior cannot be separated from that which is posterior, as the cause cannot be separated from its effect: consequently, the spiritual world cannot be separated from the natural world, nor this from that; and thus the angelic heaven cannot be separated from the human race, nor the human race from the angelic heaven; wherefore it is provided by the Lord, that they should be mutually useful to each other, the angelic heaven to the human race, and the human race to the angelic heaven. Hence the angelic abodes are indeed in heaven, separate, as to sight, from the abodes of men, but still they are with man, in his affections of goodness and truth." This the author confirms by several texts of Scripture, and by various remarks; after which he proceeds to say, "Hence it is evident, that there is such a connexion between the angelic heaven and the human race, as that the one subsists from the other; and that the angelic heaven without the human race would be in the situation of a house without a foundation, for heaven terminates in the human race, and reposes on it. The case in this respect resembles that of man individually: his spiritual things, which are those of his thought and will, flow into his natural things, which are those of his sensations and actions, and there terminate and subsist. Did not man possess the latter also; or were he destitute of these bounds or ultimates, his spiritual things which are those of the thoughts and affections of his spirit, would flow off, as things without a termination or without a bottom. The case is similar when man passes out of the natural world into the spiritual, which takes place when he dies: being then a spirit, he no longer subsists upon his own individual basis, but upon the common basis, which is the human race.—Hence it may appear, that the human race and the angelic heaven form a one, and owe their subsistence, mutually and reciprocally, to each other; wherefore the one cannot be taken away from the other." (*Last Judgment*, n. 9.)

I know not how the above extract may recommend itself to the reader; but to me it appears to contain more solid knowledge respecting the nature of man and the economy of the universe than is to be found in any other writer; and to be quite irrefutable. If so, the notion of the conflagration of the world and of the universe must be utterly chimerical.

on the contrary, two or three General Judgments have taken place before? If the Last Judgment was not to be performed at *the end of the world*, but at *the end of the age*; and if "the age" denotes the whole duration of a certain order of things as regards the dispensations of God to man; then, as it is certain that there have been, since the beginning of the world, several such ages and dispensations, it will be reasonable to conclude, that the end of each of the former of them, like the end of the last, was attended with a General Judgment upon those who had lived under it. Accordingly, the Scripture clearly teaches, how much soever its testimony upon this subject may generally have been overlooked, that such is the fact. As it prophetically announces that the last age and dispensation ever to come to its end or consummation would then be attended with a General Judgment, so does it historically record, that each of the former of such ages and dispensations was attended at its end by a General Judgment. Its testimony to this effect, therefore, we will briefly notice.

That from the beginning of the world, the specific connexion of its inhabitants with their Divine Parent has been regulated by four different dispensations, and they have been bound to him by four distinct covenants, the human subjects of which may be regarded as composing four general churches, is universally known. Adam and his posterity to the flood, lived under one dispensation: God then "established his covenant with Noah and his seed after him:"\* another covenant was made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and their descendants, of which the laws were given by Moses: and finally, "grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."† It is also known, that the three first of these dispensations were entirely corrupted, and the covenants broken, by those to whom they were given, among whom the churches thus formed in consequence perished: and that the case would be the same with the fourth dispensation and covenant, is predicted through a great part of the Apocalypse, and by the Lord in person in Matt. xxiv., and, summarily, in that question of his which supposes

\* Gen. ix. 9.

† John i. 18.

a negative answer, "Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?"\* The language in which the judgment upon the three former of these churches is described being of the same symbolic kind as that in which the judgment upon the last is predicted, it has not been generally understood to relate to any transaction in the spiritual world, but has been confined to the calamities with which, in the natural world, the apostate members of those churches were at length overtaken; and yet, that the descriptions refer to judgments in the spiritual world also, may easily be inferred. Thus, as has already been seen, the passing away of heaven and earth, and convulsions in the heavenly bodies equivalent thereto, are constantly predicated in reference to the Last Judgment, and to the coming of the Lord for its performance: and these are predicated, not only in reference to the judgment which the Christian world is still expecting, but to the judgments on each of the former churches. The Apostle Peter, for instance, informs us, that the same sort of catastrophe as is described by the prophets under the figure of the conflagration of heaven and earth, is described by Moses under the figure of a flood: he says, "By the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth, standing out of the water, and in the water; whereby the world that then was, being overflowed by water, perished: but the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word, are kept in store, reserved unto fire, against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men."† We find then, that as the destruction of heaven and earth by fire is one of the forms by which the Last General Judgment is described, so the destruction of the world that then was by a flood is the form by which the General Judgment upon the Adamic Church is described: if then the Last General Judgment was not to consist solely, nor at all, in the conflagration of the visible universe, but in a judgment upon those who had passed out of the natural into the spiritual world, the judgment upon the members of the Adamic Church did not consist solely, and probably not at all,‡ in a flood of material waters, but in

\* Luke xviii. 8.

† 2 Pet. iii 5, 6, 7.

‡ That the eleven first chapters of Genesis do not contain an exact detail of natural events, but a history of the spiritual state of

a judgment upon those who had passed from the material into the spiritual world.

The Noetic church did not long continue as one: "in the days of Peleg was the earth divided,"\* and being scattered at Babel, they no longer continued to be "of one language and of one speech;"†—that is, they divided into different forms of worship and doctrine; and all the ancient nations mentioned in the Old Testament were various branches of this church. Hence it does not appear that there was any General Judgment upon the whole together, till the Lord came into the world and performed the judgment on the Jewish church; which itself sprung out of the Noetic church, and most of the constitutions of which, as is well known, were selected from those which had previously been in use: but specific judgments upon various branches of it are mentioned in several parts of the Old Testament. Thus Sodom was destroyed by fire from heaven; and under this fact, performed in the natural world, was doubtless represented a judgment in the spiritual world, upon all of the same character who had passed into that world by death.

But, not to dwell upon the judgments on those more ancient churches; it will be sufficient for our present argument if it can be shewn, that the Lord himself performed a judgment, while in the world, of the same nature as the Last Judgment, which he then also prophetically declared that he would, at his Second Coming, accomplish. To such a judgment, many of the prophets of the Old Testament clearly refer. Their predictions respecting the Coming of the Lord into the world, are frequently connected with the announcement of a judgment then to be performed by him. They even represent the execution of such a judgment as inseparable from that work of redemption which all acknowledge that he came to accomplish; for without the removal thereby of evil spirits from the immediate influence which they then exercised upon the world, there could

mankind in those ages, couched in the language of allegory, being the only style in use among the people whose history it describes; and that literally true history begins with the account of Abraham; may be seen in "the Plenary Inspiration."

\* Gen. x. 25.

† Gen. xi. 1.



have been no salvation for the human race.\* But do we find, in the New Testament, any plain intimation that such a judgment was performed accordingly? This question may be most decidedly answered in the affirmative. The New Testament repeatedly notices the fulfilment of predictions in which the coming of the Lord to redeem mankind is connected with the execution of a judgment: and it presents, besides, other independent tes-

\* "Wait ye upon me, saith the Lord, until the day that I rise up to the prey: for my determination is to gather the nations, that I may assemble the kingdoms, to pour upon them mine indignation, even all my fierce anger: for all the earth shall be devoured with the fire of my jealousy. For then will I turn to the people a pure language, that they may all call upon the name of the Lord, to serve him with one consent." (Zeph. iii. 8.) Here is a plain prediction of a General Judgment, described with the symbolic accompaniment of the burning of the earth, as immediately to precede the establishment of the Christian religion.—"I will shew wonders in the heavens and in the earth, blood, and fire, and pillars of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and terrible day of the Lord come." (Joel ii. 30, 31.) Here is a description of a day of judgment with the usual adjuncts; and this prophecy is declared by Peter (Acts ii. 16) to have been then fulfilled. "But who may abide the day of his coming, and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap.—And I will come near to you to judgment.—For behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be as stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that it leave them neither root nor branch.—Behold I send you Elijah the prophet, before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord." (Mal. iii. 2, 5, iv. 1, 5.)—Here is a sufficiently plain announcement of a day of judgment, in predictions applied by the evangelists, and by the Lord Jesus Christ, to himself while in the world.—"For he cometh, for he cometh to judge the earth: he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth.—Clouds and darkness are round about him; righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne; his lightnings enlightened the world; the earth saw and trembled: the hills melted like wax at the presence of the Lord, at the presence of the Lord of the whole earth: the heavens declare his righteousness, and all the people see his glory.—For he cometh to judge the earth: with righteousness shall he judge the world, and the people with equity." (Ps. xcvi. 13. xcvii. 2 to 6, xcviii. 9.) A work of judgment is here clearly announced, and depicted with abundance of the appropriate figures: and these three Psalms plainly treat of the Lord's coming into the world, and of the salvation which, by his works of judgment, he would procure for mankind. Many similar passages might be adduced; but these may suffice to shew, that, according to the prophecies of the Old Testament, the advent of the Lord in the flesh was to be accompanied with the performance of a General Judgment.

timonies to the same truth. Thus when John the Baptist announces that he was the forerunner of one who was greater than himself, he speaks also of him whom he preceded as coming in the character of a Judge: "He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire."\* What plainer description of a General Judgment can there be than this? It is in fact described under nearly the same images as the Lord uses, in several of his parables, for delineating the Last Judgment generally looked for by Christians. Thus he concludes the parable of the wheat and the tares with this declaration: "In the time of the harvest, I will say unto the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn."† This the Divine Speaker himself explains to be a figurative description of the Last Judgment still generally expected: "The good seed," he says, "are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one:—the harvest is the end of the world [in the original, as elsewhere, *the consummation of the age*]:—as therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be at the end of this world. The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity, and shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father."‡ Now the only difference between this parable and the saying above quoted of John, is, that, in the parable, the wicked are compared to *tares*, and by the Baptist to *chaff*: in other respects, the figures used are the same. In both, the good are compared to *wheat*: in both, the taking of the good into heaven is called *the gathering of the wheat into the Lord's garner or barn*: in both, the casting of the wicked into hell is called *burning of the chaff, or tares, with fire*. Jesus says that this work should be performed at the consummation of the age,

\* Matt. iii. 11, 12.

† Ch. xiii. 30.

‡ Ver. 38 to 43.

or at the close of the dispensation of divine things then commencing; accordingly, all allow that the parable relates to the Last Judgment: but John says that Jesus, of whom he was speaking, *had his fan in his hand*, to make the requisite separation, *then*: Is it not then demonstrably evident, that just such a judgment as the Scripture predicts at what is commonly called *the end of the world*, or at the consummation of the dispensation then commencing, is affirmed by the Scripture to have been actually wrought while the Lord was in the world;—that time being also *the end of the world*, or *the consummation of the age*, to the Jewish Church, and to the whole remains of the Noetic Church likewise? If the Scripture affirms that a General Judgment was *to be* performed by the Lord at his second coming in the spirit, it affirms with equal positiveness that a General Judgment *was* performed at his first coming in the flesh. The one rests upon the same authority as the other, and if we deny the one we must deny them both.

But not only does John the Baptist announce that He before whom he was sent was coming to perform a work of judgment; but the Lord Jesus Christ repeatedly declares the same thing: “The Father,” saith he, “judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son:—And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man.”\* Is this supposed only to mean, that a sort of judgment was then to be passed upon the Jews in this world, the destruction of whom, as a nation, did speedily follow? This interpretation of the words is guarded against by its being added, “Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation.”† These words relate, not to any resurrection of the body, but to certain operations, attendant upon the judgment, in the spiritual world, which he was then about to perform, while, as to his natural body, he was yet in the natural world: hence he speaks of it as being just about to take place—“the hour is coming;”—and to prevent any from imagining, nevertheless, that it was a distant judgment of which he

\* John v. 22, 27.

† Ver. 28, 29.

was speaking, he makes the declaration more explicit still two or three verses previously: for he there says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming and *now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God."\* Plainly enough then the whole passage relates to a judgment he was then about performing: and it is here described, in such figures as are often used when this subject is treated of, as a resurrection of the good to life eternal, and of the wicked to damnation.

But if we were to dwell particularly on all the passages in which the Lord himself speaks of the judgment which he was engaged in performing in the spiritual world, at the same time that, as to his natural humanity, he appeared in the world of nature, this discussion would be protracted to a great length: I will therefore only mention, very briefly, one or two more. We find him then, in another place, saying, "For judgment am I come into this world."† And again, most explicitly, "Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out."‡ It is acknowledged by all, that by the prince of this world is in Scripture meant the devil. Now it is very remarkable, that a casting out of Satan is elsewhere spoken of when the subject is respecting a General Judgment. Thus, in reference to this very judgment performed by the Lord while in the world, the prophet speaks of the falling of Lucifer from heaven.§ To the same effect, in reference to the Last Judgment generally believed to be yet future, John the Revelator declares, that he saw a great dragon cast out of heaven; and he explains this dragon to be that old serpent, called the devil and Satan.|| Just in the same manner the Lord says in Luke, when the disciples returned and told him that even the devils were subject unto them through his name, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven."¶ Evidently then, the circumstance described as the falling of Satan from heaven, is a thing essentially belonging to the performance of a General Judgment. Then put these facts together. John the Revelator says that such an occurrence *would take place at the last judgment of all*: Isaiah announced that it would take place *at the judgment to be performed by the Lord while in the world*: and Jesus him-

\* Ver. 25. † Ch. ix. 39. ‡ Ch. xii. 31. § Isa. xiv. 12.

|| Rev. xii. 9.

¶ Luke x. 18.



self twice declares, that it *did then actually happen*: how then is it possible to retain any doubt, that the Lord Jesus Christ was actually engaged in performing a judgment in the spiritual world, while, as to his assumed human nature, he was personally present in this?

Both parts—the latter as well as the former,—of our first proposition, may now, I trust, appear sufficiently established;—namely, That the General Judgment announced in Scripture as to be performed at the Second Coming of the Lord, was not to take place in the natural world, as commonly supposed, but in the spiritual. If the Last Judgment announced in the New Testament be not the only General Judgment ever accomplished on the natives of this earth, but, on the contrary, there have been two or three such, before; then, doubtless, this would be executed in the same manner as those. It is certain that, at former judgments, particularly at the most indisputable of them, that performed by the Lord while in the world, there was no gathering together, in this world, of all who had previously died, no appearing of the Judge in the clouds, and no destruction of the globe and of the visible universe: consequently, neither were such events to occur at the Last Judgment of all. All former General Judgments were executed in the spiritual world: consequently, that world must be the scene of the Last Judgment also.

II. Proceed we then to the confirmation of our second proposition,—That the Last Judgment has, in the spiritual world, been executed accordingly.

Here I am to endeavor to shew, that, independently of the assertions of Swedenborg, there are various considerations tending to evince, that the Judgment has been accomplished.

First, be it observed, that, according to our views, there always exists, how little soever men in general may be aware of it, the closest communication between the spiritual and the natural worlds. Man, as to the interiors of his mind, is a spiritual being, and in constant connexion with his like in the spiritual world; though of this he cannot, except in very extraordinary cases, be sensible, while his spiritual part is invested with a natural covering, which is the seat of his conscious perceptions while he lives on earth. This is, in fact, only

a different way of stating the doctrine generally received among Christians, that man receives influences both from heaven and hell: and how can it be otherwise, if the Apostolic declarations are true, that angels "are ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation;" and that "the devil," or the infernal powers in the aggregate, "goeth about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he shall devour." But though the springs of all man's thoughts and actions are thus either in heaven or in hell, his most immediate unearthly associates are spirits in the intermediate state or region between heaven and hell; all of whom belong, indeed, either to the heavenly or to the infernal kingdom, and are, as to their interiors, either angels or devils, though, not having yet entirely put off their external state, they have not entered into their final abode. Man himself, as to the interiors of his mind, is a spirit of this kind; with this difference, that although he is every moment of his life in connexion, according to the nature of his ruling inclinations, with heaven or with hell, he is not yet irrevocably bound either to the one or to the other: so long as he remains here his ruling love may be changed: and thus he is associated as to his internal part with spirits of both classes, and is not, as they are, incapable of altering his inward state.

If then this view of the subject be correct (and that it is so, will probably further appear in the sequel of this Appeal: and surely it is a view that is highly agreeable to reason;) if man be thus so closely connected with the inhabitants of the spiritual world, particularly with those of the intermediate region; it necessarily follows that any great change in the state of that world, particularly of the intermediate region, must make also an extraordinary change in the state of man as to the interiors of his mind, and induce great alterations in his modes of thinking. It may also be expected that the effect of such an operation in the spiritual world as that of the General Judgment, must be felt in the natural world also, and that judgments answering to it in importance would take place in the civil affairs of the world, particularly among the nations belonging to the professing church. If it be true, as would follow from the above statement, that the interior causes of all things are in the spiritual

world, it will follow, that the performance of such a work as the Last Judgment there, must, sooner or later, be marked in the natural world also with corresponding effects.

In the second place, I would observe, that the conclusion respecting the effects in the natural world of the judgment in the spiritual thus arrived at theoretically, has been practically confirmed in all former instances. As far as the annals of mankind enable us to determine, never was a judgment performed in the spiritual world, but corresponding effects resulted in the natural world also. If it be true, as generally believed, that the last posterity of the Adamic church was swallowed up by a flood, here was a catastrophe in the natural world indeed: and if, as noticed above, there is reason to conclude, that by the history of the flood is not meant that a flood of waters really overwhelmed the world, there still cannot be a doubt that great calamities, of which, in a figurative, natural sense, a flood of waters is an expressive emblem, did overtake the abandoned nations. So, at the consummation of the Noetic and establishment of the Israelitish church, when a representative coming of the Lord was exhibited by his presence in the cloudy pillar, great judgments were literally executed on the Egyptians and the Canaanites, at that time the principal nations of the consummated Noetic church; as had previously been executed, soon after the calling of Abraham, on Sodom and Gomorrah. But here again we find our most unequivocal example in the judgments that fell upon the Jews. We have seen that a judgment was certainly executed by the Lord in the spiritual world while he abode personally here: and we know that, some time afterwards, the most dreadful calamities overtook the whole Jewish nation; indeed, the whole face of the world was soon afterwards entirely changed. We may conclude the judgment in the spiritual world to have been finished at the Lord's ascension: and thirty years after this event, the troubles broke out in Judæa, which issued in the destruction of Jerusalem, the desolation of the whole country, and the end of the national existence of the Jews. It is to be expected, that the changes in the natural world, which is the world of effects, must be some time subsequent to the changes

from which they proceed in the spiritual world, which is the world of causes: and from this example it would appear, as if about thirty years were the period, in which a judgment in the spiritual world begins to give rise to corresponding judgments in the world of nature.

Now as we evidently see, that, sooner or later, such judgments in the spiritual world, have, in all former instances, been followed with great troubles in the natural world, we may reasonably conclude, that the performance in the spiritual world of the last judgment of all, would, in due time, be followed by the usual visitations in this scene of existence.

Have then any visitations that may probably be supposed, by their magnitude and extraordinary character to have had such an origin, been experienced, within the last half century, by the nations of Christendom? for to them, more particularly, as forming the professing church, must such judgments belong. Do not the recollections of every one who reads this question immediately rush forward with an affirmative answer? In the wars, and other dreadful calamities, which began with, and rose out of, the French revolution, has not every serious observer of passing events noted features very different from those which attended the wars and convulsions of former times,—of all times later than the first full establishment of Christianity? Will he not allow them to have been such as are fully commensurate with the ideas suggested by the “distress of nations and perplexity, causing men’s hearts to fail them for fear,” announced by the Lord as among the signs of his Second Coming? which coming, we have seen, in the natural world, is a consequence of the judgment performed in the spiritual. There was one feature in the late contests so entirely peculiar, that it well deserves to be particularly noted; and that is, that the war at last raged in every nation on the whole face of the globe that bears the Christian name; a circumstance which never occurred before since Christianity began. Not only did Europe, from west to east, from north to south,—from France to Russia, and from Naples to Sweden,—heave the billows of her population against each other in more enormous masses than were ever before assembled for the purpose of mutual destruction; but the American



world, where the religion of Europe had been transplanted, was equally seized with the destroying mania; till from one extremity to the other of that vast continent,—from Canada to Chili,—the flames of war raged with as great violence, in proportion to the number of the people, as in the western hemisphere. In Asia and Africa too, wherever Christians had planted colonies, the demons of carnage were let loose; whilst, likewise, the waters of every sea were swelled with human blood, poured into it with a profusion beyond all that had ever, in former ages, discolored its waves. Never before, since the Christian religion was vouchsafed from heaven to be a blessing to mankind, was the whole mass of its professors thus raised by a simultaneous impulse, and arrayed against one another; as if they had all agreed as one man, while disagreeing in everything else, to disown the empire of the Prince of peace: never indeed before, since the world began, was any war excited, which deluged the surface of the globe with such wide spread desolation. Posterity will read of the events which the middle-aged part of the present generation have witnessed, with greater wonder, than that with which we in our childhood used to read of the innumerable hosts of Xerxes and the exploits of the Greek and Roman conquerors: all the surprising histories of antiquity will appear but records of insignificance, when compared with the history of our times. There have, it is true, been wars in all former ages; and if the late tremendous series of conflicts had been of a common description I should not think of urging them as an argument on this occasion: but if all must allow them to be of a totally unprecedented character, my readers cannot think that I press them too far, in calling upon them to refer such events to an adequate interior cause. What adequate cause of such wonders can be assigned, but some great convulsion in the moral and spiritual world displaying itself in corresponding events in the world of nature? what, in fact, but the performance of a judgment there, whence flow as a necessary consequence, natural judgments here?

And if the war was of so astonishing a character, what have been its effects upon the states of Christendom? During its continuance, several were sometimes

swept from the map of Europe in a single campaign: and though the most considerable were restored at the peace, it was with such great alterations, both in their internal polity and external relations, that it is strictly correct to say, that the entire face of the European, yea, of the whole Christian commonwealth has been completely changed. To apply the prophetic phrase in the sense which commentators usually assign to it;—the former heaven and earth of every state of Christendom have passed away; and they have been, with scarce an exception, so entirely new-modelled, that they have received, politically, a new heaven and earth in their place.

Now it may be observed as at least a remarkable coincidence, that the troubles which have had so extraordinary a career and termination, broke out at exactly the same distance of time after the date assigned by Swedenborg for the performance of the Last Judgment in the spiritual world, and of which he published his account in the year 1758, as that which intervened between the conclusion of the judgment performed by the Lord while in the world and the troubles which led to the destruction of Jerusalem.

But if the political changes experienced by Christendom have been so great, how has it fared with her ecclesiastical constitutions? Are we not here particularly struck with the change which has been effected, almost before our eyes, in the state of the papal power, once so terrific and irresistible? It is a fact acknowledged by the Protestant interpreters of Scripture (and indeed the features of the portrait are so plain, that nothing but strong prejudice can close the mental eye against a recognition of the original,) that the great harlot, whose name is mystical Babylon (Rev. xvii.), is a personification of the Roman Catholic religion: consequently, the judgment denounced upon her (chs. xvii. and xviii.) must denote, primarily, according to our view of the nature of the Last Judgment, the removal from the intermediate region of the spiritual world to the regions of despair, of those who were confirmed in the evils of that religion; that is, of those who made religion a pretext for establishing their own dominion over the minds and bodies of men. Now the consequence of such a judgment in the spiritual world, must be, the diminution of

the power of such persons in this world, and the loosening of the influence of that religion over men's minds. Do we not then behold manifest proofs, which multiply around us continually, that Babylon, even in this world, has received her judgment; and, consequently, that the Last Judgment in the spiritual world, which is the cause from which the other is an effect, has been performed? The Roman Catholic religion, so far as it consists in the holding of certain doctrines and practising of certain forms of worship, may probably continue for ages, just as the Jewish religion, though the Jewish church has long since undergone its judgment both in the spiritual and the natural worlds, continues to this day; but the Romish religion as to that essential part of it which procures for it in the divine Word the name of Babylon,—that is, considered as a system for tyrannizing over men's minds by the prostitution of sacred things for that purpose,\*—has received its fatal judgment, and never can become formidable any more. We have not, indeed, heard for ages,—in fact, not since the Protestants succeeded in fully establishing their independence, of any attempt on the part of the popes to exercise the power, which they formerly claimed, of dethroning princes and transferring at pleasure their dominions to others: still such a dissolution of their power as is included in the denunciation, “Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen,” was an event reserved for our times. The influence of the Romish hierarchy remained very great, in all the countries which continued to profess that religion, till within a recent period. We have seen the pope himself dragged from his throne, and degraded into a mere tool of the ambition of Napoleon: and though he has since been restored by the allied sovereigns from motives of policy, yet is he shorn of his beams; his influence is annihilated; and he now sits in *St Peter's chair* (as they call it) more as a puppet than a prince. His desires may perhaps be as capacious as ever; and to promote their aims he has restored the order of the Jesuits, formerly the right hand of the papal power; but never can he restore the causes from which that order derived its

\* That this is the true signification of Babylon throughout the Scriptures, may be seen in the *Plenary Inspiration*, &c. p. 361 to 381.

efficiency. The spirit and soul of Jesuitism are gone, in the removal from their immediate connexion with the human race of those who formed Babylon in the spiritual world; and hence, however good may be the will of the pope's new myrmidons, being no longer supported by the same influence from the world of causes, they never can revive much more of the old Jesuits than the name. Thus the restoration of the pope to his throne is by no means synonymous with the restoration of his power. The spell which bound the minds of men to his sway, has been broken, and can never be renewed. We are continually hearing of new circumstances which demonstrate, that his authority is no longer much respected, even by nations which continue to profess his religion. The events of the last few years in Spain, Portugal, and Italy, evince that, by great numbers, in those countries, once the chief seats of his influence, it is now entirely despised: and the new states of South America, the inhabitants of which were so long among the most devoted slaves of the Roman see, are shewing a determination to follow up their rejection of civil with the abolition of ecclesiastical tyranny, and, by allowing freedom of worship, are giving the fatal blow to priestly domination. Who would have expected, a few years ago, to behold an accredited envoy from Mexico making a speech at a Bible Society's meeting, avowing it to be the general wish of his countryman to read the Scriptures in their own language, and their joint conviction, that civil and religious liberty are as essential to the welfare of a people, as are, to the support of life, the two gases which compose the air we breathe? Even the priests of those countries seem resolved to be *popish* priests no longer; for, in contradiction to a main characteristic of that hierarchy, many of them are distinguishing themselves among the most active promoters of information and general improvement. Here are new moral phænomena indeed. Evident tokens are everywhere springing up, evincing, that the pretension on the part of any fallible man to the power of opening and shutting heaven at pleasure, which has been the grand engine by the use of which the Roman pontiffs attained such extraordinary influence, will soon be scouted as ridiculous through every country of Christendom, and that



men will soon everywhere wonder by what strange infatuation their fathers could have submitted to such palpable arrogance and blasphemy. The cause of that infatuation, according to our views, was, that multitudes of those who, in this world, had promoted the Romish ecclesiastical corruptions,—of priests and monks and their adherents,—had established themselves in the intermediate region of the spiritual world, acting as clouds by which the light that is ever in the effort of flowing from heaven into the human mind was in great part intercepted, and instead of it were substituted such influences as tended to uphold the domination which such spirits, and their like in this world, affect: and the reason why such infatuation prevails no longer, is, as we are convinced, because, by the Last Judgment, those spirits are removed, and light from heaven, thus gaining new access to the minds of men, exposes, as one of its first effects, the absurdity of such pretensions. Can any one look at the wonderful change, in this respect, which is everywhere experienced, and not acknowledge the cause which we assign for it to be the most worthy, yea, the only adequate one, that can be conceived? Can any one, on its being suggested to him, fail to recognise, in these surprising events, plain signs that the Last Judgment is accomplished?\*

\* Here also, it may be observed, we have a clew that would guide to a sound decision of the famous Catholic question. The opponents of Catholic emancipation consist of those, who draw their opinion on the subject from theology and ecclesiastical history; who thence know what are the tenets of that religion, which a church that professes to be infallible cannot explicitly revoke, and what are the enormities to which those tenets have lent their sanction. These resist the Catholic claims under the apprehension, that the moment Protestants cease to tread the Catholics under their feet, they will mount over their heads, and will, sooner or later, relume the fires of Smithfield. Nor do those who take this view of the question merit the ridicule which is sometimes thrown upon them. If they are practically wrong, they are not wrong without a reason. Their opinion is founded on the ample experience of former times. It would unquestionably have been the right opinion much less than a hundred years ago: and as they know nothing of the great spiritual cause which has intervened to invalidate the deductions from ancient experience, it is not to be wondered at, if, dwelling as their thoughts do upon positive facts, they fear to trust to the altered state of feeling which is everywhere apparent. On the other hand, the advocates of Catholic emancipation consist of those who allow themselves to be carri-

But not only do the effects in the natural world of the accomplishment of the Judgment in the spiritual display themselves in the way of visitations, but also, in direct dispensations of mercy; for the sake of which, indeed, all divine judgments are performed. The calamities with which they are accompanied, are only designed to remove obstructions out of the way, and to make room for the reception of the benefits which the Divine Judge ever has in view. If the wicked who occupied the intermediate region of the spiritual world, were, by the judgment there, cast into hell, it was that the good who were mixed with them, or reserved in the lower parts of the spiritual world on account of them, might be raised into heaven; and also, that the divine efflux of spiritual life and light, which they intercepted in its passage to men on earth, might have free course: in like manner if Christendom has been visited with tremendous troubles, as a first consequence of the performance of the judgment in the spiritual world, it is that a second consequence may follow, and that the divine outpouring of spiritual life and light may produce the blessings for which it is bestowed. If then we see, in the world around us, marks, in this way, of the activity of this divine efflux, they are sure signs that the judgment in the spiritual world has been performed. In what we have already noticed, even such marks are palpable. But how evident is the change, and that a change for the better, which, in many other respects likewise, has passed upon

ed along by the spirit of the present times. Though unacquainted with the true cause, they *feel* that the facts on which their opponent's arguments are grounded, are grown obsolete. They perceive that the state of the human mind, among Catholics as well as Protestants, has undergone a great change, and that were the Romish priesthood again to urge the pretensions to unlimited dominion which made them once so formidable, and which lay at the source of all the wicked deeds which they perpetrated in the name of religion, it would only deprive them of the share of influence which they yet retain, and make them universally, among Catholics as well as Protestants, objects of execration. Practically, as we conceive, these are right, though they know not the reason. They see so plainly one of the consequences of the Last Judgment, as to be willing to legislate upon it, though not aware of its true cause. And is not the extent to which this acknowledgment of an effect of the Last Judgment is forcing itself upon the minds of men, another effect of that judgment, and an additional argument that it has been performed?

the state of mankind;—a change so obvious to all, that we can scarcely take up a magazine, or newspaper, or any new publication whatever, without finding it adverted to with admiration! How constantly are some of the features of this mighty alteration dwelt upon, in almost every public meeting, political or religious! I had asked above,\* “Does not every voice confess that we are living in a most extraordinary era of the world? Is not every mind impressed with the conviction, that there is something almost preternatural in the character of the present times?” And I had asked further, respecting the improvements everywhere springing up, whether they are not “continually calling forth, from every quarter, exclamations of surprise, and expanding every bosom with the hope, that the opening of a new and happier day than the world has ever before seen is now dawning on mankind?” Every reader who is at all acquainted with the modern press, or who has made any observations on passing events for himself, will be ready to give these questions an affirmative answer. Multitudes of extracts from periodical and other publications, returning such an answer, might easily be adduced; but their frequency makes it unnecessary to cite them: I will only take, as a sample, a short passage from the prospectus of a new literary undertaking,† which came into my hands while writing this Section, and which is, in part, a perfect echo of my above cited questions: “The most unthinking, as well as the most prejudiced,” says the well-informed writer of this paper, “must be struck with the fact, that the period in which we live is extraordinary and momentous. Amongst the great body of the people an unparalleled revolution is at work: they have awoke from that ignorance in which they had slept for ages, and have sprung up in their new character of thinking beings, qualified to inquire and to discuss; and despising both the despotism and the bigotry that would prohibit or impede their improvement.—The intellectual spirit is moving upon the chaos of minds, which ignorance and necessity have thrown into collision and confusion; and the result will be, a new creation. Nature (to use the nervous language of an old writer) ‘will be melted

\* p. 20.

† The London Encyclopædia,  
9\*

down and recoined;’ and all will be bright and beautiful.” It is thus that every attentive observer is impressed by the character of the present times. Consider then, my reflecting readers, whether so great an effect can be without a cause! And to what cause can it, with any degree of reason, be assigned, but to that mighty change in the interior sphere of human minds effected by the performance of the Last Judgment in the spiritual world, and to the pouring thence of new energies from heaven into the awakening faculties of man?

Let us here ask, How might such a pouring of energies from heaven, and of light thence, into the minds of men in general, be expected, in the first instance, to operate? What the writer of the above quotation calls “the intellectual spirit moving upon the chaos of minds,” is what the Scripture calls “the spirit of God moving upon the face of the waters.” The ultimate object of the divine movement is, that man may be made in the image and likeness of God; in other words, that man should rise to the full dignity of his nature, as the recipient, without perverting them, of love and wisdom from God; for it is only such a being as this,—a being in whom the spiritual faculties as well as the natural endowments belonging to human nature are properly developed,—that the Word of God emphatically denominates *a man*. Nevertheless, though it is as a spiritual being that man is last perfected, it is as a natural being that he first comes into existence; and his natural faculties, from the lowest to the highest of them, are successively unfolded, before his spiritual ones are opened. Hence the operations of the Divine Spirit, in Genesis, consisted in calling into birth all the lower parts of creation, beginning from the lowest of all and advancing to the higher, before man himself was produced; all which inferior objects are exact images of the various faculties that belong to the natural part of the human constitution; whilst that which is called *man*,—the image and likeness of God,—is man considered as to his spiritual part,—a receptacle of love and wisdom from God;—to which it is given to reign over the lower powers. Such was the order in which the Divine Spirit proceeded at first: such then is the order in which the new outpouring of divine influences might be expected to operate now:—and ac-



cordingly, such is the order in which it is now working its wonders anew among mankind.

Hence then it is that we see, in every direction, such astonishing improvements in whatever has for its object the well-being of man as to the natural part of his constitution. Look at the extraordinary manner in which the science and practice of agriculture have, during the last thirty or forty years, been advanced; which has been such, that although the population of the globe, especially of the Christian part of it, has increased in a ratio beyond all that was ever known before (a circumstance which itself is a most striking result of the increased energy with which life, from the first Source of life, is flowing into nature), the earth has not proved incapable of supplying food for the increasing multitude, but has poured forth her productions with corresponding profusion: proclaiming the fact, that the divine command requiring her to bring forth her increase,—in other words, the divine energy producing it,—has gone forth anew. Behold, again, the wonderful manner, in which manufacturing skill and power have been augmented;—the astonishing perfection given to machinery; which is such, that wood and metal appear to be informed with human intelligence, whilst they are actuated by a force imparted by inanimate agents immensely beyond any that could be yielded by animal strength. Hereby every production of human ingenuity required for the necessities, comforts, or convenience of man, has been multiplied to an extent which not long since would have been deemed impossible; and so reduced at the same time in price as to be made attainable by all: in which, again, we behold a new outpouring of divine energies, rendering, in an unprecedented manner, the hands of men productive. Look, also, at the amazing improvements, in many other things; such as the banishment of night from our streets by the introduction of gas-lights, and the splendor added by the same invention to our saloons and public edifices; or the ameliorations in ways and roads, and in the facilities for conveying goods and travellers by land and by water; which are such that, in a great degree, as to its separating power, space is annihilated, and the remotest parts of the globe are brought into vicinity. Here, again, who can fail to see some

extraordinary agency at work, giving an unwonted impulse to human energies, and exhibiting, in its extreme or lowest effects, the increased action of the world of life and activity?

But if we proceed to a slight view of some of the moral phenomena of the times, greater wonders, if possible, will demand our admiration. Observe, then, the surprising advance, on the one hand, of science; and, on the other, the universal increase of the desire for knowledge, combined with the extraordinary multiplication of the means for its diffusion. Since the time at which we believe the Last Judgment, in the spiritual world, to have taken place, every branch of Science has been improved to a most unexpected extent, whilst many new ones have been added, and others have assumed a form which makes them virtually new: thus Geology, whose discoveries are so highly interesting, whose conclusions are so momentous, and whose practical uses are so eminent, is entirely the offspring of modern times: whilst Chemistry, which is so continually astonishing us with fresh wonders, has undergone, in our times, a change equivalent to a new creation.\* Nor is the progress that has been

\* Speaking lately in company, of the great modern improvements in Science as one of the effects of the light flowing from the spiritual world in consequence of the accomplishment of the Last Judgment, a scientific friend, who was struck with the idea, was so kind as to send me, soon afterwards, the following list of

*“Improvements in Natural Science made about or subsequently to the era of the Last Judgment, 1757.*

“The distinct classification of natural beings and substances of all kinds,—the determinate recognition of their respective specific identity, and denotation of that identity by names,—which have effected so many subordinate improvements in science, were not made until about the above era.—The Linnæan system of natural history, which was materially concerned in the improvement just noticed, was promulgated from about 1735 to 1778, and came into full reception about the latter period, or perhaps somewhat before.—The doctrine of the regular succession of the stratified masses constituting the crust of the globe, forming the foundation of the modern science of Geology, was first delivered distinctly, and to a considerable degree demonstrated, by Lehman in 1756, and by Mitchell in 1760.—Five primary planets, and eight or ten secondary planets or satellites, have been discovered since 1757. No addition to the former class of heavenly bodies had been made *from time immemorial*; and none, I think, to the latter, for a century before; but of this I am not certain.—Many departments of mathematical and phy-

made by elegant literature of all kinds less rapid and extraordinary; whilst, of late, particularly, a great pro-

sical science which had scarcely any existence before, and some which were absolutely unknown, have risen to great importance since 1757. Among the former are several branches of mathematical analysis, which, in the investigation of problems in physics, have nearly superseded the old and tedious geometrical methods.—The sciences of Mineralogy, Chemistry; (see below) and Electricity, have assumed a form since 1757, altogether distinct from that which they bore in the previous period. It would seem indeed that a new *discrete* degree was developed in the sciences at that era; a marked character of which was the improvement first noticed in this list.—A great variety of truths merely suspected in the latter part of the seventeenth century and former part of the eighteenth, were seen in the clearest light after the above era.—The entire science of galvanism, or voltaic electricity, which has exerted so great an influence on that of Chemistry, as well in theory as in practice, and given rise to so many discoveries in it, has arisen since the era of the last judgment: it was absolutely unknown before.—The true nature of thunder and lightning was discovered about 1750, by Dr Franklin. Is it in *correspondence* [thunder and lightning being used as figures, in Scripture, of the revelation from heaven of Divine Truth] that this discovery should have been made at the same time that the spiritual sense of the Scriptures was being revealed to mankind? [The first volume of Swedenborg's theological works was printed in 1749.]

“The steam engine was invented (as a machine for use) about 1700, or a year or two before: but it received its grand improvements about 1764.—The application of iron as a principal article in civil and naval architecture, did not take place until after 1757. It was employed in arms and machinery for ages before.

“The following are a few of the particular discoveries in chemistry since the year 1757:—The constitution of the atmosphere.—The composition of water.—The existence of latent or combined heat (that is, of certain phænomena referred by philosophers to such an origin: great fallacies, no doubt, are involved in the prevailing doctrines on the subject; but these phænomena were unknown, in the science of heat, before).—The radiation of terrestrial heat; that is, the passage into space in right lines of the heat obtained from artificial sources, independently of the solar beams; as well as of the heat any substance has previously imbibed from the sun. By this property every substance in nature emulates the sun, as to his diffusion of heat.—The doctrine of the mutual relations of the regular geometrical forms assumed by almost every substance, or the science of *crystallography*.—The *doctrine of the definite proportions* in which bodies mutually combine; by which every substance in nature, whether simple or compound, is shewn to combine in a quantity represented by a *certain number*, which number represents the substance in *all its relations*; called the *atomic theory*.—There is some difference of opinion amongst chemists, as to what truly constitutes the *metallic nature*; but there are probably about *thirty-nine* metals, of which *twenty-four* have been discovered since 1757. How immense an addition to the science this is, is evinced by the

portion of the new works which appear have a moral aim in view, and are adapted to assist in promoting the best interests of mankind.\* Whence can such an increase of natural light result, but from a new outpouring of light from heaven, of which, when received in the natural faculties of the human mind, improvements in science are the natural offspring? And while every kind of mental

facts, that not one new metal was discovered between 1541 and 1732, and only four between 1732 and 1757. The polarization of light, discovered within these few years, forms a more important addition to the science of optics, than any single improvement it ever received. "It is of course to be understood that most of the new doctrines in science to which a date has been here assigned, did not come into full reception in the minds of philosophers until a few years subsequent to their date."

\* I cannot here refrain from citing the following just and striking remarks, on this subject, from the Literary Gazette, of Nov. 12, 1825, which met my eye almost while writing the above. "Even the cheapest little sheet that issues from the press is good of its kind. Fifteen years ago—ten years ago, it was hardly possible to lift up a periodical paper without pollution. The press teemed with what was desperate in politics, destructive in morals, ruinous in social relations, and horrible in religion: the ignorant were deluded, the irresolute perverted, the firm shaken, by almost every act of this tremendous engine."—This however, like the political convulsions which have shaken the world, was equally a consequence of the increased influence poured from the spiritual world, and from the Lord himself, into the world of nature, which is received by every one according to his state, and at the presence, therefore, of which, the evil bring forth without reserve what they before strove to conceal; and it was thus that, in the spiritual world itself, the evil were constrained to discover themselves at the period of the judgment. This effect of the wonderful operation appears now, however, in a great measure, to be passing away. To continue our quotation: "The change, now, is as delightful as it is extraordinary. Except in the newspapers, there is not one among fifty periodical publications which is not well disposed, and useful to every rank in life—not one in hundreds of an injurious tendency to the best interests of mankind. And we do not speak of works in extensive circulation, and of course well known; but of multitudes which fill their narrow circle only, but fill it in a way which half a century ago would have attracted general applause. In excepting the newspapers, too, we would be understood as not undervaluing those powerful, and, when rightly conducted, admirable productions. The extent and variety of their information is astonishing; the style in which their original remarks are written, and the character they display, are such as challenge almost unmixed admiration, when we consider the circumstances under which they are brought forth."—"Consider," says the Divine Prophet, in reference to the present times,—“Consider the fig-tree: when his branch is yet tender, and putteth forth leaves, ye know that the summer is nigh.”



food is thus provided in such abundance the appetite for its appropriation is not less remarkable; and institutions which have for their object to produce this appetite, and to supply it with the means of obtaining satisfaction, are everywhere springing up. The discovery of the systems of Bell and Lancaster, followed, as it has been, by various other improvements, has formed a new era in the science of education; the advantages of which are now imparted to multitudes at a less expense than was formerly incurred in bestowing them on a few; and by establishments having this for their object, those advantages are being diffused, not only throughout this favored country but nearly through the whole globe. To these laudable establishments, the new and admirable institution of Infant Schools is becoming a powerful auxiliary; which, by commencing the culture of the human mind at its first dawn, withdraws it from the consequences of parental neglect and the contagion of parental depravity, and must effectually prevent ignorance and barbarism from being, much longer, the necessary inheritance of the poor. Nor is the love of knowledge and of diffusing it, which in the present age is so conspicuous, satisfied with providing for the instruction of the young. The man desires to perfect what the child began; and thus Mechanics' Institutions, and Literary Societies of various kinds, have been founded and are spreading through the land; whilst by publications containing the elements of science in a cheap and popular form, and by cheap editions of literary works of established reputation, intellectual cultivation, of every species, is made accessible to all. To all, from the infant to the man, and from the peasant to the prince, the flood gates of knowledge are set open: and the nations rush eagerly to imbibe the mind-informing streams. Can we behold such truly astonishing changes in the intellectual condition of mankind, without referring them to a spiritual cause? Can we fail to see in them the effect of a new outpouring of light and life from heaven, preparing the way, by raising and cultivating the rational faculties of man, for his spiritual improvement?\*

\* I cannot here refrain from adding a passage from a high-church publication, which fell under my observation while this was going

Nor is it only of natural knowledge that the streams are thus set flowing: by that truly extraordinary, that greatest of modern benevolent establishments, the British and Foreign Bible Society, we also behold dispensed, with a copiousness unknown to former ages, the streams of salvation. The formation of such a society is itself a phenomenon; and its operations have been a series of wonders. When we behold men of all Christian sects, abandoning their particular differences, unite to distribute the Scriptures free from the glosses and corrupt expositions which most sects have appended to them; who can fail to discern in the work the mighty finger of God? When we see, by the exertions of this Society, not only all Christendom supplied with the inestimable treasure, but almost all the nations of the earth, the multitudes of a thousand tongues, who never knew before that God had given such a revelation of his will, enabled to read the Word of God, in their own languages, and presented, in their own languages, with the Word of God to read; who can help exclaiming, "This is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes?" Who can fail to discover in it the effects of a new divine influence, providing, more extensively than ever, the means of human salvation? Nor are the efforts which are making by Missionary Societies, and the success which, in some instances, has attended them, unworthy of being noticed in this sketch of the signs of the present times. If the theology which the Missionaries teach is not such as we can regard as pure, its effects upon the degraded idolater are

through the press, and which evinces, that those effects of the last judgment that we are here noticing, have powerfully forced themselves upon the attention even of those, whose natural prejudices and interests (I do not say this invidiously) most indispose them for admitting their reality, and even incline to regard them as an evil. The following strong statement is from the *Quarterly Theological Review* (No. IV. p. 399): "It is now too late to press objections, be they strong or weak, against universal education—against that (if we may speak chemically) hyperoxygenated passion for imparting knowledge, which is so prevalent in our times. We are not left to argue and debate upon what might have been better or worse; we must act upon what we find in operation. *The fountains of the great deep have been broken up, and a deluge of information,—theological, scientific, and civil—is carrying all before it, filling up the valleys, and scaling the mountain-tops.* A spirit of inquiry has gone forth, and sits brooding on the mind of man.

highly beneficial: and who can fail to recognise the divine energies which are now pouring forth for the improvement of the human race, when he beholds, among their results, the Hottentot reclaimed from his filth, and the Otaheitan from his impurity,—the barbarian brought within the circle of civilized humanity,—the savage elevated to the man!

Here, I think, I may close this Section. Were I to attempt to enumerate all the symptoms of the mighty change that has taken place in the state of mankind, I might write a volume on this subject alone. Allow me, then, ye Candid and Reflecting, to request your serious attention to the instances which have been adduced, the number of which your own recollections will readily augment. Is not every one of them, taken singly, of sufficient magnitude to excite surprise, and to awaken serious meditation on the subject of its cause? But when such hosts of them press on our notice together, are we not compelled to refer the cause to something of a very extraordinary nature indeed? Here are multitudes of phænomena which every observer sees and owns; and every one who observes them owns likewise, that “the most unthinking, as well as the most prejudiced, must be struck with the fact, that the period in which we live is extraordinary and momentous:” and not only, that “amongst the great body of the people an unparalleled revolution is at work,”—that “the fountains of the great deep have been broken up,”—but that the main seat of the revolution is in the mental part of man,—“that the intellectual spirit is moving upon the chaos of minds,”—that “it sits brooding on the mind of man,”—and this with such energy as to authorize the expectation, that “nature will be melted down and re-coined.” Where, I repeat, can the cause of such a simultaneous alteration in human minds be looked for, but in the world of minds itself,—in other terms, in the spiritual world, with which man, as to his mind, is most intimately connected? And what change there could be adequate to the production of so great a change as we are witnessing here, but the performance of the Last Judgment,—the entirely new state which is thence induced on the intermediate region of the spiritual world, the seat of man’s most immediate spiritual association,—and the

consequent outpouring from heaven of new streams of light and life into the world of nature? The illustrious Swedenborg, so long ago as the year 1758, declared\* that, by the Last Judgment, then just accomplished, spiritual liberty was restored, and the state of servitude and captivity in which men's minds were previously held, in regard to spiritual subjects, was removed; and in the year 1763 he added,† that the efflux of divine energies from heaven into the world, which had been in a great degree intercepted by the presence of those called the dragon and his angels in the intermediate part of the spiritual world, was, by their ejection, restored. These assertions were made, when no remarkable effects of the change had yet begun to manifest themselves in the world, and when, consequently, they could not be corroborated by acknowledged facts: but how wonderfully have they thus been corroborated since, and what striking confirmations of them does every day's experience now bring with it! Am I then doing any more than anticipating the suffrage of many of my readers, when I conclude that our second proposition is sufficiently established;—that, independently of the assertions of Swedenborg, there are various considerations tending to evince, that the Last Judgment has, in the spiritual world, been performed? Will not all acknowledge, that the spiritual cause thus assigned for the astonishing change in the state of mankind, is, at least, likely to be the true one? and since no other can be conceived that is adequate to the effect, will not the candid admit it to be at least highly probable, that the Last Judgment, so long looked for and so much misunderstood, has, at length, actually been accomplished?

\* In his work on the Last Judgment.

† In his Continuation of the former work.



## SECTION V.

*A Human Instrument Necessary, and therefore granted.*

I MAY now appeal to you, I apprehend, with confidence, my Reflecting and Candid Readers, respecting the means by which the great events, considered in our preceding and second Sections, must be communicated to mankind. If it be true that the long expected last judgment has at length been performed,—that the long looked-for time of the Lord's second coming has at last arrived,—in what manner would it be reasonable to conclude that the important tidings should be conveyed? Are we to behold a multitude of angels in the air, sounding great trumpets, and vocally calling the attention of the world to the crisis which has arrived? In their spiritual, which, as regards this subject, is their only true sense, the prophecies which speak of such an announcement doubtless must be (and we trust have been) accomplished: from heaven,—that is, from the Lord through heaven,—the divine truths of the Holy Word must be (and we trust have been) discovered anew; for of the revelation, or communication, of Divine Truth, the sounding of trumpets is, in the Word, the expressive symbol: but if, as I hope has been sufficiently proved, the second advent of the Lord was not to be of a personal nature; if the scene of the last judgment was not to be in this lower world, any otherwise than as to its effects; it follows, that it was not by a visible exhibition of angels with trumpets that the annunciation was here to be made. Yet, most unquestionably, some annunciation was necessary. The events which have passed in our times, and which are transacting still, upon the theatre of the globe, are indeed such as proclaim, with a voice of thunder, that some most extraordinary operation from the spiritual world upon the world of nature is in action; they are indeed such as demonstrate, when looked at under the proper aspect, that the last judgment has been performed and that the second coming of the Lord is taking place: thus, when the truth is distinctly proclaimed, they bear witness to it in the most decisive manner: but they

require a human announcer to give their loud voice a distinctly speaking tongue. The second coming of the Lord, also, as we have seen, is mainly effected by the re-discovery of the momentous and saving truths contained in his holy Word: among the signs of the times which we have noticed, are the loosening of the hold which erroneous sentiments had taken on the minds of men, a general change in men's modes of thinking, and such an alteration in the state of the human mind as indicates a preparation for the reception of juster views of divine truth than have heretofore prevailed: but still it is obviously requisite that the truth itself should be explicitly announced, and, of consequence, that a Human Instrument should be raised up for that purpose. This appears to be the evident dictate both of reason and of necessity: and to these is added the confirming suffrage of experience. Never did a similar crisis in the history of the divine economy occur before, but human agency was employed to make it known. Prior to the flood, the divine purpose was communicated to Noah; who, as tradition reports, warned, though in vain, his abandoned contemporaries; whence he is called by an Apostle "a preacher of righteousness."\* When the time had arrived in which Jehovah proposed to verify to the Israelites the promise made to their fathers of putting them in possession of Canaan, a band of angels was not sent to announce the fact to the whole nation, but God revealed himself to Moses and commissioned him to bear the tidings to his brethren. Even when the Lord Jesus Christ appeared personally on earth, and when, if ever, it might be supposed that merely human agency might have been dispensed with, he did not shew himself to the people, till John the Baptist had announced his approach, and had proclaimed the kingdom of heaven to be at hand. Surely then, at his second coming, which was not to be a personal one, a human herald must be altogether indispensable. Had it occurred in the first ages, when Christians were looking daily, though mistakenly, for the second coming of their Lord, and when they had not yet learned to regard such an interposition as impossible, the appearance of

\* 2 Pet. ii. 5.

such a herald would have been hailed with joy: and it surely ought not now to be scouted as ridiculous, by any but them, who, because mankind have lived so long under an economy different from that which prevailed before the introduction of Christianity,—under an economy in which continually repeated missions of divine messengers were not required,—have forgotten that such missions ever existed at all, and that, without them, Christianity itself could not have been established. It is, however, an unquestionable truth, that how long soever the suspension may have lasted, one more example of them must be afforded;—one case more must inevitably arise, in which, without the employment again of one more such messenger, the last great purpose in the divine economy must fail to take effect, the last great predictions of holy writ must remain unfulfilled forever. I cannot then think that any of you to whom this Appeal is addressed,—any of the Reflecting of any Denomination whatsoever,—can treat such an occurrence either as impossible or as ridiculous: I am sure you will all acknowledge, that, at the era of the second coming of the Lord, some Human Instrument or other must be divinely enlightened to declare it, and to communicate the important truths, which at that advent are, as we have seen, to be unfolded to mankind.

Of this branch, then, of the inquiry to be pursued in our present Section, it must be quite unnecessary to go into any further discussion. That at the crisis which we are supposing, and which, as was attempted to be shewn in our second and last Sections, there is reason to believe has arrived, a Human Instrument must be necessary, will, I am persuaded, be generally acknowledged: the only question then which we have now to consider, is, whether such an Instrument has been granted in the person of the every way respectable and truly illustrious Swedish philosopher and theologian, the Honorable Emanuel Swedenborg.

II. An intelligent person once asked our author, How he, from a philosopher, became a theologian; to which he answered, “In the same manner as, on being called by the Lord, fishermen became apostles.” He added, “That he had himself been a spiritual fisherman from his youth;” which he confirmed by shewing, that in the

spiritual language, formed of natural images, in which the Scriptures are written, a fisherman means a person who investigates and teaches natural truths, and afterwards spiritual truths in a rational manner; whence the Lord, when he called his first disciples from their nets, said to them, "Follow me, and I will make you *fishers of men*,"\* obviously meaning, *instructors of men in the truths which relate to salvation*. His interrogator expressed his satisfaction at this answer by the remark, "That the Lord alone knows of whom to make choice for communicating to mankind the truths to be discovered at his second advent, and whether the suitable Instrument is to be found in the person of a mitred prelate, or of one of his footman." This, certainly, was the judgment both of piety and of good sense. In the case before us, however, even human reason must concur in the fitness of the choice made by Divine Wisdom. All that is known of the illustrious Swedenborg, points him out as a man in whom was centered everything that could qualify a human being for such an office.

In his external circumstances there is nothing that can be objected against the probability of his being made the subject of a selection which *must* fall on some one, except that he was not a priest, or a minister of religion by profession: but if this objection may with any appear to bear some shadow of reason, a little reflection must convince every one that it carries none of the reality. On what former occasion did the Divine Being first publish a new dispensation of his grace and truth, by the instrumentality of any who had been ministers of the former? Though Moses was the son-in-law of a gentile priest, and from the necessity of the case, acted as a priest himself in the inauguration of Aaron into the holy office, he did not previously, nor ever professionally, belong to the order. In like manner, it was not from the priests of the Jewish Church that the Lord selected his apostles. The Baptist, indeed, was the son of a priest, and entitled, by the Levitical constitutions, to exercise the office himself; but when he arrived at the age fixed for that purpose by law, instead of taking up the function by ministering in the temple, he began in the

\* Matt. iv. 19. Mark i. 17.



wilderness to proclaim the advent of the Messiah: and the circumstance of his origin, instead of depriving his character of parallelism with that of Swedenborg, really, if a coincidence so unimportant be worth remarking, makes it more perfect; since Swedenborg also was the son of a priest, the excellence of whose character is the subject of encomium with all who have had occasion to mention him,—of a modern Zacharias, who, with Elizabeth his wife, “walked in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless,”—the good Bishop Swedberg. But Swedenborg’s intrinsic qualifications, moral and intellectual, for the discharge of such an office, were such as all must allow to be appropriate in the highest degree. In him were united the utmost integrity, piety, and innocence of manners, with the most comprehensive understanding and most extensive attainments in knowledge. The former excellences, it will generally be admitted, were necessary to prepare him for his office at all; and without the latter, it will easily be seen, he could not have discharged it with effect. He stands not in the character of a new *prophet*, in the sense usually applied to that term, and as he has sometimes been denominated in derision; nor in that of a writer of additions to the Word of God, as he has also been maliciously represented.\* The Lord engages, at his second coming, to appear “in the clouds of heaven,”—or in the outward covering of his Word, which is its literal sense,—“with power and great glory,”—with the full evidence and clear brilliancy of the genuine truth of his Word, to which the letter is the covering: and this could not have been accomplished by sending a prophet, again to speak in the enigmatical, and never, without special illumination, clearly understood language of prophecy, but only by raising up a teacher who, under the influence of divine guidance and illumination, should be able to see in the Scriptures, and to comprehend in

\* To suppose that the writings of Swedenborg, are to be received as new books of Scripture, or that they are either offered by him, or accepted by us, in any such light, is, either ignorantly or perversely, to assume a gross error.

It was his belief, and it is *ours*, that the canon of Scripture actually was closed by the Revelation of John, though that book does not say so; and what he delivers are presented as truths drawn from the Scriptures now existing, not as new Scriptures given in addition.

his own mind, the sublime truths he was to teach, and to communicate them in a manner suited to their depth and importance. Hence the necessity that the Human Instrument made choice of on this occasion should be a man of learning. Something similar occurred at the first promulgation of Christianity: for the apostles were not *all* ignorant men. To diffuse the knowledge of the gospel among the Jews, persons possessing nothing beyond common Jewish attainments, but guided by the Spirit of God, were competent: but when "a chosen vessel" was required "to bear the Lord's name before the Gentiles, and kings, and to the children of Israel"\* scattered among the Gentiles,—to carry the gospel to the learned and polished nations of those times,—a man was miraculously called to the work, who, having been born and long resident at Tarsus, a polite Grecian city, was as much skilled in the learning of the Greeks, as, by having been brought up at the feet of Gamaliel, he was versed in the doctrines of the Jews. Much more was it necessary that, in this age of the general diffusion of natural knowledge, the Human Instrument for first communicating the truths to be made known at the Lord's second coming, should stand upon a par with the first of his contemporaries in scientific attainment; especially as, while all the general doctrines he was to unfold were to be far more clear, and more easily intelligible, than those commonly received at present as the doctrines of Christianity, some of the truths to be discovered were to be of the most profound kind, requiring for their full development the highest talent for abstruse investigation, and for their full comprehension the most exalted powers of the best cultivated mind. In Swedenborg, every requisite gift was centered. Well imbued, under the tuition of his learned father, and at the University of Upsal, with all the usual elements of a learned education, he for a time cultivated classical literature with diligence and success. He then applied himself to the most solid and certain of the natural sciences, and, not only by domestic study and by correspondence with foreign literati, but by repeated travels in all the distinguished parts of Europe,—in Germany, Italy, France, Holland, and

\* Acts ix. 15.

England,—he made himself thoroughly acquainted with all the knowledge of his time, and was admitted, by general consent, to a station among the first philosophers of the age. As, in the midst of the distinctions with which he was honored by his compeers in learning and by sovereign princes, he never forgot for a moment his original piety and modesty,—his scientific writings constantly breathing the humble and devotional spirit of a true Christian philosopher,—the acquisitions he made in natural science must be acknowledged to have formed an admirable preparation, and a most suitable basis, for the apprehension and explication of the spiritual truths which he was to be the instrument for unfolding. Between the book of nature, read by the eye of humble intelligence, and the Word of God, every one intuitively perceives there must be an exact agreement; and spiritual views can never be so little likely to partake of delusion, as when they make a copious store of sound natural science their foundation. An extensive acquaintance with the knowledge of God in his works, must be the best preparation for a superior perception of the knowledge of God in his Word: and by this was Swedenborg eminently distinguished.

Admitting then what, we have seen, none will deny, that, at the era of the Lord's second coming, a Human Instrument, to communicate the truths then to be made known, would be necessary; and assuming what, also, it is hoped, has at least been shewn to be probable, that that long expected era has at length arrived; sure I am that all the Candid and Reflecting will confess, that no man more likely to be made that Instrument could be found in Christendom, than the man whose qualifications for the office I have here briefly described. *A priori*, there is all the probability which such a case admits, that the pretensions of the eminent and honorable Emanuel Swedenborg to be received in this character, are well founded.

But to raise this probability into certainty, an examination of the views he has communicated in sustaining the character he claims, would be necessary. To go into this with fulness, would require an extensive survey of his writings; which would demand a work of much greater magnitude than this is intended to be. As noticed in the Introductory Section, I am here compelled to shape my

course in the direction marked out by opponents, particularly by the Rev. Mr Beaumont, and am consequently confined to the particular explanation and defence of those points, which, in the opinion of our adversaries, it is most difficult to maintain: if then I should succeed in shewing reason to believe, that the views and doctrines most objected to are nevertheless true, it surely will be difficult to doubt, that the light by which the illustrious Swedenborg was enabled to discover them, must have had a higher origin than self. I am indeed satisfied, that a most convincing work might be written on the Internal Evidence which the writings of Swedenborg bear to their own truth; and this, not only in the great and leading doctrines which they deliver and so scripturally and rationally establish, but in innumerable more minute points, in which they speak to the heart, and experience, and best intelligence, of man. There is no subject which they handle which they do not lay open in a deeper ground than is done by any other author: in particular, they discover so profoundly and distinctly the inward operations, the interior workings, of the human heart and mind, and unveil man so fully to himself, that no person of reflection can attentively peruse them, without feeling a monitor in his own breast continually responding to their truth. Will it not follow, that a writer who can thus penetrate into the most secret things, and place them in a light which is at once seen to be the true one, must have been the subject of a superior illumination, and must, as he avows, have been admitted to a conscious perception of the things of that world, in which the essences of things lie open? But I am content, for the present, to rest the truth of Swedenborg's pretensions to the divine illumination he professes to have received, in addition to the support they derived from his personal character, upon the evidence of those sentiments of his which are advocated in the various Sections of this Appeal. May I not recur to the view which has been given, in our second Section, of the true nature of the Second Coming of the Lord, as resting on the strongest basis of Scripture and reason? But that view, so different from the hitherto received notions, yet so obviously true, was first delivered by Swedenborg, and was seen by him, because the time for the fulfilment of



the prophecies relating to it had arrived. May I not advert to the view of the Resurrection, supported in our third Section, as presenting the only scriptural and rational conceptions on the subject? Yet this view, though partially seen by many, was, in like manner, first conclusively established by Swedenborg, who learned it, he reasonably declares, from the experience granted him to enable him to discharge his commission. But may I not, especially, appeal to the view of the Last Judgment delivered in the Last Section, and to the evidence there adduced of its having been accomplished, as being as plain as it is new? Yet the performance of that great event was announced by Swedenborg, from, as he averred, his own experimental knowledge, while, as yet nothing had been experienced in the world to support his assertion. But by what clouds of evidence has it been supported since! Here is, it really appears, a proof equivalent to the greatest miracle of Swedenborg's having been the Human Instrument requisite to announce the Second Coming of the Lord and the execution of the Last Judgment: he announced them; and we see, by palpable facts, that they must have taken place. He neither performed direct miracles, nor delivered predictions: but, by declaring the accomplishment of a great event in the spiritual world which was inevitably to be soon followed by great effects in the natural world, which effects we have so unquestionably witnessed, he has given his testimony all the authority it could derive either from miracles or prophecy, without making it injuriously compulsive.\* In our subsequent Sections and

\* Swedenborg states, in his account of the Last Judgment, that when the interiors of those who were inwardly wicked, who had established themselves in the intermediate region of the spiritual world, were laid open, by the nearer presence of the Divine Judge, "they no longer appeared, as before, like moral Christians, but like demons: they raised riots, and wrangled with each other about God, the Lord, the word, faith and the church; and, as their concupiscences of evil were at the same time loosed from restraint, they rejected all belief in such matters with contempt and mockery, and rushed into enormities of all kinds.—As the opening of their interiors advanced, so the order established in societies was changed and inverted. They who displayed most power in their reasonings against the sanctities of the church, rushed into the centre and seized the government: and the rest, whose power by reasonings was less, gave place to those in the centre, and acknowledged them as a sort of guardian angels.

in the sequel of this, we shall, I trust, meet other important points that are indubitably true, and capable of the most conclusive proof, but to discover which, in the first instance, must have either required knowledge absolutely supernatural, or a perception of truth in the Scriptures beyond the reach of any unassisted human intellect. They are fully equal in interest and moment to the most magnificent ideas which can be formed of the truths to be communicated at the second coming of the Lord: do they not then as fully accredit him whose writings convey them, as the herald of the second advent, as the preaching of John the Baptist, owned by the Saviour himself, accredited him as the herald of the first?\*

Thus things began to assume the form of hell." Now if this had been delivered as a prophecy of what took place at the French revolution, could it have described it more faithfully? In the transactions which then occurred, was there not exhibited, in the natural world, a perfect image of what this extract states had been performed in the spiritual? In France, after works full of reasonings against the sanctities of religion had long been eagerly read, did not they who were strongest in the same principles assume the government? were not enormities of every kind practised, and religion actually abolished by law? Who then may not behold, in the one course of transactions, effects resulting from the other, and which, without divine instruction, Swedenborg could not have known?

\* We will here support what has been advanced above by some testimonies of men of rank and learning.

It will perhaps be most proper to begin with the account which Swedenborg gives of himself, as contained in a letter to his friend, the Rev. T. Hartley; and then to see how it is corroborated by what others have testified respecting him. (The letter was published by Mr Hartley in his prefaces to his translations of the works "On the Intercourse between the Soul and the Body," and "On Heaven and Hell." The original Latin may be seen in a former periodical publication called the Aurora, vol. ii. p. 224, &c. from which I have in some places corrected Mr Hartley's version of it. The date of it is 1769.) "I take pleasure in the friendship you express for me in your letter and return you sincere thanks for the same; but as to the praises which you bestow upon me, I only receive them as tokens of your love of the truths contained in my writings, and so refer them to the Lord our Saviour, from whom is all truth, because he is **THE TRUTH**. (John xiv. 6.) It is the concluding part of your letter that chiefly engages my attention, where you say as follows: 'As after your departure from England disputes may arise on the subject of your writings, and so give occasion of defending their author against such false reports and aspersions as they who are no friends to truth may invent to the prejudice of his character, may it not be of use, in

Now against the illustrious Swedenborg, as standing in this character, what objections are raised? None that

order to refute any calumnies of that kind, that you leave in my hands some short account of yourself; as concerning, for example, your degrees in the university, the offices you have borne, your family and connexions, the honors which I am told have been conferred upon you, and such other particulars as may serve to the vindication of your character, if attacked; that so any ill-grounded prejudice may be obviated or removed? For where the honor and interest of truth are concerned, it certainly behoves us to employ all lawful means in its defence and support.'—After reflecting on the foregoing passage, I was induced to comply with your friendly advice, by briefly communicating the following circumstances of my life.

“I was born, at Stockholm, in the year 1689 [it has been ascertained that this should be 1688], Jan. 29th. My father's name was Jesper Swedberg; who was bishop of West-Gothland, and a man of celebrity in his time. He was also elected a member of the [English] Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts; for he had been appointed by King Charles XII. as bishop over the Swedish churches in Pennsylvania and London. In the year 1710 I began my travels, first going to England, and thence to Holland, France, and Germany; whence I returned home in 1714. In the year 1716, and afterwards, I had many conversations with Charles XII. king of Sweden, who was pleased to bestow on me a large share of his favor, and in that year appointed me to the office of Assessor of the Metallic College; in which I continued till the year 1747, when I resigned it; but I still retain the salary annexed to it, as an appointment for life. My sole view in this resignation was, that I might be more at liberty to devote myself to that new function to which the Lord had called me. On my resigning my office, a higher degree of rank was offered me: but this I utterly declined, lest it should be the occasion of inspiring me with pride. In 1719 I was ennobled by Queen Ulrica Eleonora, and named *Swedenborg*; from which time I have taken my seat with the Nobles of the Equestrian Order in the Triennial Assemblies of the States of the Realm. I am a Fellow, by invitation, of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Stockholm: but I have never sought admission into any other literary Society, as I belong to an angelic society, wherein things relating to heaven and the soul are the only subjects of discourse and entertainment; whereas the things which occupy the attention of our literary societies are such as relate to the world and the body. In the year 1734, I published at Leipsic the *Regnum Minerale*, in three vols. folio; and in 1738 I took a journey into Italy, and stayed a year at Venice and Rome.

“With respect to my family connexions: I had four sisters. One of them was married to Eric Benzelius, afterwards promoted to the Archbishopric of Upsal: and thus I became related to the two succeeding Archbishops of that see, both named Benzelius, and younger brothers of the former. My second sister was married to Lars Benzelstierna, who was promoted to a provincial government. But all these are dead: however, two bishops who are related to me are still

would demand any notice, were they not continually reiterated, and did they not sway the minds of those

living: one of them, named Filenius, is Bishop of East-Gothland, and now officiates as President of the Ecclesiastical Order in the Diet at Stockholm, in the room of the Archbishop, who is infirm; he married my sister's daughter: the other, named Benzelstierna, is Bishop of Westermania and Dalecarlia; he is the son of my second sister. Not to mention others of my relations who enjoy stations of dignity. I live, besides, on terms of familiarity and friendship with all the bishops of my country, who are ten in number; as also with the sixteen Senators, and the rest of the Nobility; for they know that I am in fellowship with angels. The King and Queen, also, and the three princes their sons, shew me much favor: I was once invited by the King and Queen to dine at their table,—an honor which is in general granted only to the Nobility of the highest rank; and likewise, since, with the Hereditary Prince. They all wish for my return home; so far am I from being in any danger of persecution in my own country, as you seem to apprehend, and so kindly wish to provide against; and should anything of the kind befall me elsewhere, it cannot hurt me.

“But I regard all that I have mentioned as matters of respectively little moment; for, what far exceeds them, I have been called to a holy office by the Lord himself, who most graciously manifested himself in person to me his servant in the year 1743; when he opened my sight to the view of the spiritual world, and granted me the privilege of conversing with spirits and angels, which I enjoy to this day. From that time I began to print and publish various *arcana* that have been seen by me or revealed to me; as respecting heaven and hell, the state of man after death, the true worship of God, the spiritual sense of the Word; with many other most important matters conducive to salvation and true wisdom. The only reason of my later journeys to foreign countries, has been, the desire of being useful, by making known the *arcana* entrusted to me.

“As to this world's wealth, I have what is sufficient: and more I neither seek nor wish for.

“Your letter has drawn the mention of these things from me, with the view, as you suggest, that any ill-grounded prejudices may be removed. Farewell; and from my heart I wish you all felicity both in this world and the next; which I make no doubt of your attaining, if you look and pray to our Lord.

“EMAN. SWEDENBORG.”

Now if the writer of this letter really was invested with the character which he assumes, could anything be more suited to that character than the whole of its contents? Does not every sentence and expression in it bespeak the truly humble, pious, and heavenly-minded man? Could any one who falsely pretended to what the Author professes, write of himself in a manner so perfectly in accord with the pretensions assumed? Would it be possible for an impostor, whether hypocritical or self-deluded, to assume that air of genuine simplicity, inward composure, and unfeigned contentedness, which reigns throughout the whole?



who are destitute of the information requisite for forming a correct judgment on the case. We will consider the two principal.

The information here delivered by the Author divides itself into two general parts: *first*, the account of his own life and general character; *secondly*, his call by the Lord to a holy office, and the consequent opening of the sight of his spirit, and endowment with the privilege of conversing with spirits and angles. We will see how both are supported by the testimony of others.

1. A confirmation of all the statements contained in the *first* part of the above letter, is given by the Rev. Nicholas Collin, of Philadelphia. This gentleman does not profess the sentiments of Swedenborg; but in the year 1801, when, in consequence of the adoption of those sentiments by many in America, the character and life of Swedenborg had there become the subjects, as he states, of "frequent and sedulous inquiries," he published the above letter of his illustrious countryman, with a comment of his own, in "the Philadelphia Gazette" of Aug. 5th, 8th, and 10th. It was reprinted in "the New Jerusalem Church Repository," published at Philadelphia in 1817, at which time Mr C. was still performing the duties of Pastor of the Swedish Church in that city. His testimony therefore is probably that of a still living witness. Mr Collin was well qualified to give authentic information, having, when a very young man, lived three years at Stockholm when "Swedenborg was a great object of public attention in that metropolis, and his extraordinary character was a frequent topic of discussion. Not seldom he appeared in public, and mixed in private societies; therefore sufficient opportunities were given to make observations on him." I extract the sentences containing the heads of Mr C.'s comment, in confirmation of some of which he goes into several details. "His family connexions were such as he relates, and well known in Sweden: some of them by myself personally. The mention of his father being, though honorable, modestly short, I shall enlarge upon it. This Jesper Swedberg was well qualified for one of the principal bishopricks in Sweden, by his piety, learning, integrity, benevolence, and all other virtues."—"Swedenborg is silent on the merits of his youth, which were great."—"The office of Counsellor in the Metallic College was conferred on him by King Charles as a reward for knowledge acquired by the labors of youth, and a means of making it very beneficial to the nation: that Board having inspection over the mines and metallic works, so important in that country; and being a constitutional department of the government."—"Swedenborg asserts with truth, that he was in favor with the royal family, and generally respected by the first classes. This was due to his learning and excellence of character."—"Swedenborg states properly his rank of nobility. He had the common degree, and was not, as many style him, a Baron; which title denotes the second class of noblemen; the first among the three classes being counts." (This is unquestionably a just account of his rank: but it may be observed, that, though he had not a title, his degree was the same as in England carries the title of Baron, or Lord; for it gave him a seat in the House of Nobles, or of Peers, in the Diet or Par-

III. The common cry, re-echoed from mouth to mouth and retailed from pen to pen, is, that he was mad;

liament of his country. The higher rank, which, he states in his letter, was offered him on his retirement from office, was, no doubt, that of Baron; which in Sweden is equivalent to our Earl.)

Mr Collin adds an account of an interview which he once had with Swedenborg: it contains nothing very remarkable, but enough to evince that his behaviour on intimacy by no means tended to diminish the respect which his reputation had excited. "In the summer of 1766," says Mr C., "I waited on him at his house; introducing myself with an apology for the freedom I took.—He received me very kindly.—We conversed for near three hours: principally on the nature of human souls, and their states in the invisible world; discussing the principal theories of psychology, by various authors; among them the celebrated Dr Wallerius, late Professor of Natural Theology at Upsal. He asserted positively, as he often does in his works, that he had intercourse with spirits of deceased persons."—"We parted," says Mr C., "with mutual satisfaction."

The next testimony that I shall offer is from a public document of the greatest authority. It is no other than an oration delivered in the Swedish Royal Academy of Sciences, on occasion of Swedenborg's death, by the Chevalier de Sandel, Superintendent of the Mines, and Knight of the Order of the Polar Star, at a meeting of the Academy held in the Great Hall of the House of Nobles, Oct. 7th, 1772. The circumstance of the delivery of such a discourse, is alone a conclusive proof of the high estimation in which the subject of it was held. If the most learned of those who have written against him had read the whole of this production, they would have perhaps been less hasty in pronouncing an unfavorable judgment. As Asmus of Wandsbeck says, (in his works printed at Breslaw) of one of his censurers who wrote under the name of *Polyhistor*, "they would have suspended their opinion concerning him, had they known that Swedenborg possessed all *their* learning in his cradle." But I must content myself with only extracting a few passages.

"Permit me," says the Orator to the noblemen and gentlemen around him, "to entertain you this day, not upon a subject which, being of an indifferent nature, might be uninteresting and might even fatigue your attention; but on a man illustrious for his virtues, and celebrated for the extent of his knowledge of every kind, whom you well knew and greatly loved, and who was one of the oldest members of this Academy. By these traits, you will immediately recognise the late M. Emanuel de Swebenborg Assessor of the Royal College of Mines. The respect that we entertained for this great man, and the affection that we bore him, assure me of the pleasure and satisfaction that you will feel in hearing him spoken of: happy shall I deem myself, if I in any degree fulfil the desire you entertain, to behold a man so dear to your hearts recalled to your minds in a manner worthy of his glorious memory. The task is difficult. The most skilful painter finds it not easy to present to the eye the exact features of certain persons: how far less easy is it to sketch and exhibit to the mental eye a genius vast, sublime, and laborious; who never rested, and never was wearied in his application even to

an aspersion which, notwithstanding some totally false and merely calumnious tales have from time to time been fabricated to support it, literally rests upon no founda-

the most profound and intricate sciences; who during many years was engaged in useful efforts to unveil the mysteries of nature, opened a new way to arrive at certain sciences, and finally endeavored to penetrate into the sanctuary of the greatest secrets, without ever losing sight of sound morality and the fear of the Supreme Being; and who retained all the strength of his genius to the last, notwithstanding that decay of the material covering of the soul which others experience at the close of a career so long, and to which so few attain: but who, having allowed his ideas free range, and having carried them as far as they could go, has given occasion to form different opinions respecting him; according to the different manner in which the same object is looked at by different persons, and the point of view from which they consider it.”—

“ Before we can penetrate the thoughts, and discover the character, of persons with whom we are in company, we usually observe at first a watchful and cautious reserve. But to be relieved from the necessity of observing this restraint in following Swedenborg, represent to yourselves the following happy assemblage of qualities: an excellent memory, a penetrating understanding, a quick conception, and the soundest judgment, united to an insatiable desire for making the most certain attainments in Philosophy, in almost all branches of the Mathematics, in Natural History, in Chemistry, in Anatomy, and finally in Theology; not to mention the Oriental and European languages, in which he was well versed. Observe in him well formed habits acting in concert with the dictates of reason, especially in regard to the admirable order in which he always arranged his ideas.—Represent to yourselves the best heart and the best character; which are evidenced by the rules he laid down for the government of his own thoughts and conduct, as I have found them noted in various parts of his manuscripts. They are as follows: ‘ 1. To read often, and to meditate well upon, the Word of God. 2. To be always resigned and contented under the various dispensations of Providence. 3. To observe always a propriety of behaviour, and to keep the conscience clear and void of offence. 4. To obey what is ordained; to discharge with fidelity the duties of one’s employment; and to do everything that depends on one’s self; to be useful to all, without exception.’—Behold here the picture of Swedenborg’s inward state of mind! None but such as are blinded by prejudice can either think or say that it is not a true likeness, or can fail to recognise in it the man himself.”

“ He lived single, but he was never dull. He enjoyed such excellent health, that he scarcely ever experienced the least indisposition. Always filled with an inward content, he under all circumstances possessed his soul in peace; and he led a life in the highest degree happy, till the moment that nature demanded her rights.”

“ He possessed a sound judgment upon all occasions: he saw everything clearly, and expressed himself well on every subject. The most solid memorials, and the best penned, at the Diet of 1761, on matters of finance, were presented by him.”—*Count Hopkins.*

tion whatever, but that on which the same imputation was thrown against an infinitely greater character. "He hath a devil and is mad: why hear ye him?"\* Such was the salutation with which the Divine Truth, in person, was assailed, when "he came unto his own, and his own received him not." The Lord Jesus Christ himself was reproached as insane by the leaders of the professing church of that day: and even his own kindred according to the flesh had so little conception of his true character, that when he began to display it by mighty words and works, "they said, He is beside himself. And they went forth to lay hold on him,"† for the purpose of putting him under restraint, as a person of disordered mind. So little capable, when in the darkness of its sensual perceptions, is the human mind, of distinguishing the most exalted wisdom from insanity! No wonder then that the proclaimer of genuine truth now should be derided with similar reproaches. "The disciple is not above his Master, nor the servant above his Lord; if they call the Master of the house Beelzebub, how much more them of his household!"‡ Such were the prophetic warnings by which the Lord prepared his disciples for the treatment they were to expect: and the experience of distant ages has proved their truth. When the Apostle pleaded the cause of Christianity before Agrippa and Festus, the Roman governor replied with the exclamation, "Paul; thou art beside thyself; much learning doth make thee mad:"§ and so, in our times, a man who has been favored with a degree of illumination as much superior to that of modern Christians in general as was the divine knowledge of Paul to the darkness which then overspread both Jews and Gentiles, is assailed with the same cry, and, while his attainments in science are admitted, it is pretended that his studies had ruined his faculties. By the Candid and Reflecting, a sufficient answer to this charge will be found in his writings, which, though a period of twentytwo years intervened between the publication of the first of his theological works and the last, exhibit the most perfect consistency of sentiment throughout, while they are all written with a regard to the most orderly and methodical arrangement, and

\* John x. 20. † Mark iii. 21. ‡ Matt. x. 24, 25. § Acts xxvi. 24.



display in their author the most acute powers of reason and extraordinary strength of memory; which last faculty is evinced by the numerous references to other parts of his works which abound in them all. These, certainly, are qualities which do not usually attend the ebullitions of insanity. Indeed, it is impossible to pretend to find in the composition and manner of Swedenborg's writings any tokens of derangement: even adversaries admit that they exhibit plain marks of a very superior mind: and they only pronounce him mad, because his works contain such statements as they might naturally be expected to contain, should his claims to acceptance, as a heaven commissioned teacher, be true.

I had here, however, almost forgotten the Rev. Mr Beaumont; for he, willing to be thought a more profound critic than any who had gone before him, objects to the manner, as well as the matter, of Swedenborg's writings. He complains that there is in them "an almost endless tautology and repetition either of expression or meaning," which, he adds, "is to me another plain indication of the author's disordered intellects." But Mr B. is determined to see nothing in the writings of the Author, or at least to produce nothing from them, in which he cannot find a pretence for censure: and this charge of tautology is of a piece with all the rest. The adversaries of Swedenborg in general only look into his works for such things as may serve to give a wrong impression. These they set forth as specimens of the whole, for the purpose of deterring others from examining for themselves; carefully suppressing those excellent and truly sublime and heavenly sentiments, upon numerous subjects of the first importance, which even they cannot help feeling, and half acknowledging that those writings contain. Thus, respecting some sentiments of our author, which Mr B. cannot deny to be excellent, he has these remarks: "What the Baron says respecting truth and good, and especially what he says respecting faith and charity, [these are fundamental things, by the by,] as also his opinion respecting man's free-will and predestination, accords in general with my sentiments, and may perhaps be read with some advantage."\* We here

\* Pp. 7, 8.

have, to be sure, an admirable specimen of what Pope calls to

“damn with faint praise ;”

yet we may be satisfied that there must be something truly striking in what Swedenborg delivers on these subjects, to extort even such praise from a man determined, when looking at his excellences, to apply the wrong end of the telescope, while for discovering what might be distorted into blemishes, he uses the strongest magnifier he could find. Accordingly, he immediately adds, “But on these subjects the Bible may always be consulted with infinitely more success; therefore quitting the Bible for Baron Swedenborg’s works, is something like leaving good wine for mere water.” Can any thing be more futile? Must he not have been sadly at a loss for an objection to offer such a one as this? All that has ever been written in illustration of the Bible, is, it seems, mere waste paper! The Bible not only contains all things necessary to salvation, but all so plainly stated, that every reader, learned or unlearned, may comprehend the whole without assistance! However, fearing that the weakness of this remark must be obvious to every one, and to evince that he only dislikes all “tautology and repetition” in others, he repeats the charge made in the page preceding: “If,” he adds, “we will read uninspired books upon these subjects, there are plenty to be found more compact and consolidated than the Baron’s writings, which are frequently both diffuse and incoherent.” This last imputation I utterly deny. I defy any man to produce a fair example of incoherence from any part of our author’s numerous volumes. If there be, occasionally, some diffuseness in his style, it arose from his desire to avoid ambiguity; he doubtless had rather seem prolix than obscure. But prolixity is by no means the general characteristic of his composition; it in fact seldom appears but in the uniform and formal mode in which he introduces his comments on each clause of the subject in his expositions of the Scriptures. Besides, who can judge of his style, that only knows it through the very disadvantageous medium of a literal translation? In the original, it is often so condensed, that it is difficult fully to render the sense in

English without greatly weakening it by dilution. I appeal as an example to the Latin of the work "On the New Jerusalem, and its Heavenly Doctrine;" which is a production truly admirable for the consolidated weight of its matter, and the correspondingly brief and sententious character of its style. But in respect to works like his, in which the matter is everything, it only displays a previous determination to be displeased, when an opponent descends to cavil about the manner: and a man who wishes to be regarded as a friend of religion in general, ought, before he resorts to such cavils, to consider whom they will hit besides. It is long ago since Jerome noticed the solecisms of Paul; and it is well known that none of the writers of the New Testament possessed a good Greek style: but who that pretends to a grain of candor regards this as derogating from the importance of their writings? Who will say that, because, as to the composition, their epistles are not faultless, there is reason to impute "disordered intellects" to the Apostles? Let Swedenborg's writings be looked at for their sentiments, and be judged of by them: and we fear not to assert, that they will be found to contain a system of theology, which, instead of being, like that of his opponents, at open variance with half the Bible, and really at variance with all the rest, is in perfect harmony with the whole; and, what is no less important, a system which, differently from all others, harmonizes all the Bible with itself.

Most unjust then, in every respect, is the representation which Mr B. gives of the writings of Swedenborg. It is fabled of the cruel Medea, that to stop her incensed father in his pursuit, she tore her tender brother Absyrt's limb from limb, and strewed the way with his mangled remains: thus, also, is Swedenborg treated by his adversary, to turn the sincere seeker from the pursuit of truth. Mr B. probably exults in the dexterity with which he has performed this feat; for he has received for it loud plaudits (uttered, I trust, in ignorance) from several of the theological Magazines. Cheered by the commendation, he probably says in his heart, something like what the notorious T. Paine has said in his "Age of Reason," on completing a not dissimilar exploit: "I have now gone through the Bible, as a man would go

through a wood, with an axe on his shoulder, and fell trees: Here they lie: and the priests, if they can, may replant them. They may perhaps stick them in the ground again, but they will never grow." So easy is it, by overlooking the design of the whole together, and taking detached passages out of their connexion, to hold up to ridicule anything whatsoever, even the eternal Word of truth itself; and so easy is it likewise for men, when they have done this, to persuade themselves that the objects of their scorn deserve it. This is just what the Anti-Swedenborg has done with the illustrious Swedenborg and his writings: it creates deformities; and then calls upon its readers to bestow on them their contempt.

“ Trunca sed ostendens disjectis corpora membris,  
Aspice ait.”—

And this is not more the case with that part of the work which contains Mr B.'s own conclusions and delineations, than with that which is entitled, “Sundry Extracts from the writings of Baron Swedenborg.” If “Sundry” means *sundered*, the title is truly descriptive. A scrap is taken from one place, and a scrap from another, while all the explanations necessary for the understanding of them are omitted: and the reader is solicited to condemn the author on account of the grotesque dress in which his antagonist presents him. Suppose a man were to steal into the wardrobe of a prince, and cutting off a snip from one elegant garment, and a snip from another, were to patch them together in the form of a fool's coat: what should we think of him, if he were to exhibit his motley compound, his thing of shreds and patches, as a dress of the prince's, instead of acknowledging that it was merely his own? Just as good an idea would such a piece of patchwork present of a royal robe, as do the extracts furnished by our adversaries in general, and Mr B. in particular, of the writings of Swedenborg. They endeavor, by garbled quotations, to make him appear ridiculous or unintelligible; and then they call upon the public to pronounce him mad. Return however the fragments to their proper places, and read them in their proper order; and the reason of the whole will appear: and then his writings, instead of lending any countenance to the imputation of insanity, com-



pletely refute it, and evince his heaven born intelligence.\*

\* We will here add some illustrations connected with the above subject.

It has given much pain to the receivers of the doctrines communicated in the Writings of Swedenborg, that the circulation of the report of his insanity, should have been materially promoted by a man so much entitled to respect as the late Rev. Mr Wesley. It is however certain, that in the part which he took in the affair, he was completely imposed upon by the Minister of the Swedish Chapel in London, Mr Mathesius, who was Swedenborg's personal and violent enemy;—and I am providentially enabled, by some documents which have recently come into my hands, to trace the progress of Mr Wesley's mind in regard to Swedenborg, in such a manner, as completely to neutralize his authority in the unfavorable conclusion which he, at last, adopted: for I am enabled to shew, that, in that conclusion, Mr Wesley stands in direct opposition to Mr Wesley himself; and that his first judgment was formed upon far better evidence than his last. It appears certain, that Mr Wesley was at one time inclined to receive Swedenborg's testimony in the fullest manner; and this *because he had had indubitable experience of his supernatural knowledge.*

Among Mr Wesley's preachers, in the year 1772, was the late Mr Smith, a man of great piety and integrity, who afterwards became one of the first ministers in our church. Having heard a curious anecdote, said to rest on his authority, I wrote to Mr J. I. Hawkins, the well-known Engineer, who had been intimately acquainted with Mr Smith, to request an exact account of it. The following (a little abbreviated) is his answer: it is dated February 6th, 1826.

“Dear Sir,—In answer to your inquiries, I am able to state, that I have a clear recollection of having repeatedly heard the Rev. Samuel Smith say, about the year 1787 or 1788, that in the latter end of February, 1772, he, with some other preachers, was in attendance upon the Rev. John Wesley, taking instructions and assisting him in the preparations for his great Circuit, which Mr Wesley was about to commence: that while thus in attendance, a letter came to Mr Wesley, which he perused with evident astonishment: that, after a pause, he read the letter to the company; and that it was couched in nearly the following words: [the letter was most probably in Latin; but Mr Wesley, no doubt, would read it in English:]

*Great Bath Street, Cold Bath Fields, Feb — 1772.*

‘Sir,—I have been informed in the world of spirits that you have a strong desire to converse with me; I shall be happy to see you if you will favor me with a visit.

‘I am, sir, your humble Servant,  
‘EMAN. SWEDENBORG.’

“Mr Wesley frankly acknowledged to the company, that he had been very strongly impressed with a desire to see and converse with Swedenborg, and that he had never mentioned that desire to any one.

“Mr Wesley wrote for answer, that he was then closely occupied in preparing for six months' journey, but would do himself the pleasure of waiting upon Mr Swedenborg soon after his return to London.

“Mr Smith further informed me, that he afterwards learned from very good authority, that Swedenborg wrote in reply, that the visit

IV. The other principal objection generally made against the authority of Swedenborg, is, that he perform-

proposed by Mr Wesley would be too late, as he, Swedenborg, should go into the world of spirits on the 29th day of the next month, never more to return.

“ Mr Wesley went the Circuit, and on his return to London, [if not, as is most probable, before,] was informed of the fact, that Swedenborg had departed this life on the 29th of March preceding.

“ This extraordinary correspondence induced Mr Smith to examine the writings of Swedenborg; and the result was, a firm conviction of the rationality and truth of the heavenly doctrines promulgated in those invaluable writings, which doctrines he zealously labored to disseminate during the remainder of his natural life.

“ That Mr Smith was a man of undoubted veracity, can be testified by several persons now living, besides myself; the fact therefore that such a correspondence did take place between the Honorable Emanuel Swedenborg and the Rev. John Wesley, is established upon the best authority.

“ On referring to Mr Wesley’s printed journal it may be seen, that he left London on the 1st of March in the year 1772; reached Bristol on the 3d, Worcester on the 14th, and Chester on the 29th, which was the day of Swedenborg’s final departure from this world. Mr Wesley, in continuing his circuit, visited *Liverpool*, and various towns in the north of England, and in Scotland, returning through Northumberland and Durham to Yorkshire, and thence through Derbyshire, Staffordshire, and Shropshire, to Wales; thence to Bristol, Salisbury, Winchester, and Portsmouth, to London, where he arrived on the 10th of October in the same year, having been absent rather more than six months.

“ I feel it my duty to accede to your request and allow my name to appear as your immediate voucher.

“ I remain, Dear Sir, your’s very sincerely,

“ JOHN ISAAC HAWKINS.”

To this I can add, that the Rev. Mr Sibly has assured me, that he has heard Mr Smith relate the above anecdote; and that he could mention, if necessary, several other persons still living who must have heard it too. He fully, also, supports Mr Hawkins’s statement in regard to Mr Smith’s veracity. Thus it is impossible to doubt that Mr Smith affirmed it; and it is difficult to suppose that he could either wilfully or unintentionally misrepresent an incident which must have impressed him so strongly, and of which the consequent change of his sentiments formed a collateral evidence.

It may be here proper to observe, that the Translation of Swedenborg’s little work on the intercourse between the Soul and the Body had been published not long previously (in 1770,) with a Preface by the translator, addressed to the Universities, urging the author’s claims to attention. This Mr W. had probably seen, and had thence conceived the desire he acknowledges, to see the author. The discovery that this desire, though it had remained a secret in his own breast, was known to Swedenborg, must have affected him very strongly: it must have convinced him that Swedenborg’s assertion, that he possessed the privilege of conversing with angels and spirits, was true: and it is natural to suppose that he would conclude from

ed no miracles. This has been replied to by his advocates with the most convincing arguments.\* Among

it, that the cause assigned by Swedenborg of his having received this privilege, namely, that he might be qualified for a holy office to which he had been called, was true also. There is, further, the strongest evidence that Mr Wesley's conviction went as far as this. I had sometime ago heard an anecdote demonstrating it related in conversation by the Reverend and venerable Mr Clowes, Rector of St John's, Manchester, whose high character for every quality that can adorn a minister of the gospel, and of course for veracity among the rest, is acknowledged by all who know him (and few are known through a wider circle—by those who differ from him as well as by those who agree with him in theological sentiment;) I therefore lately wrote to him to request a written statement of the particulars, with leave to publish it with his name; with which request he kindly complied. The part of his letter (dated January 19, 1826) which relates immediately to this subject, is as follows:

“ My very dear Sir,—In full and free compliance with your wishes, as expressed in your kind favor of the 16th, I send you the following Memoir of the late Mr Wesley, as communicated to me by my late pious and learned friend, Richard Houghton, Esq. of Liverpool, who was also intimately acquainted with Mr Wesley, insomuch that the latter gentleman never visited Liverpool without passing some time with Mr Houghton. As near as I can recollect, it was in the spring of the year 1773 that I received the communication, one morning, when I called on Mr Houghton at his own house, and at a time too, when the writings of the Hon. E. S. began to excite public attention. These writings were at that time unknown to myself, but not so to my friend Mr Houghton, who was in the habit of correspondence with the Rev. T. Hartley on the subject, and was very eager to make me acquainted with them. Accordingly, in the course of our conversation, my friend took occasion to mention the name of Mr Wesley, and the manner in which he, on a late visit to Liverpool, had expressed his sentiments on those Writings. ‘ We may now (said Mr Wesley) burn all our books of Theology. God has sent us a teacher from heaven, and in the doctrines of Swedenborg we may learn all that is necessary for us to know.’ ”

The manner in which Mr Wesley here expressed himself was strong indeed; so much so, that were it not certain that his mind must have been at that time under a very powerful influence in Swedenborg's favor he might be suspected to have spoken ironically. This I observed in my letter to Mr Clowes; to which he replies. “ I can hardly conceive, from the manner in which it was expressed by Mr Houghton, that irony had anything to do with it:” and Mr Houghton must have known with certainty whether it had or not. But an examination of dates will shew, that Mr Wesley's statement to that gentleman was made while the impression from Swedenborg's supernatural communication was acting in all its force. Mr Clowes' interview with Mr Houghton was in the spring of 1773: Mr Wesley does not appear to have been at Liverpool between that time and the 10th of the preceding October, when he returned from his last great circuit. In that circuit he did visit Liver-

\* See in particular Hindmarsh's Letters to Priestley, Let. i.

other considerations it has been urged, that if no human instrument who has a divine commission is to be accept-

pool, and was there early in April, 1772. This then must be the "late visit" mentioned by Mr Houghton; and this was *within six weeks after he had received the extraordinary communication from Swedenborg*. This is certain: and it is also highly probable, that, at the time of his visiting Liverpool, the effect of that communication was greatly strengthened, by the verification of the announcement, which, we have seen, Swedenborg had made to him of the day of his own death. He died, as he had announced, on the 29th of March; there can be little doubt that a notice of it appeared in the papers: it would thence, it is highly probable, be known to Mr Wesley when he was at Liverpool, about a fortnight afterwards: and the words he then uttered to Mr Houghton will not appear stronger than he might be expected to use, when two such recent and completely incontrovertible proofs of the truth of Swedenborg's pretensions were operating on his mind.

Yet Mr Wesley, thus miraculously convinced of the truth of Swedenborg's pretensions (as far, at least, as relates to his intercourse with the spiritual world,) afterwards exerted himself to check the extension of the same conviction to others! in which, however, he only afforded a proof of Swedenborg's constant assertion, that miraculous evidence is inefficacious for producing any real or permanent change in a man's confirmed religious sentiments. When Mr Wesley uttered the strong declaration respecting Swedenborg and his writings, he spoke of the latter, rather from what he expected to find them, than from what he actually knew them to be. The probability is, that he at this time knew little more of them than he had learned from the tract on "the Intercourse:" which contains, probably, nothing that he would except against; especially as it is certain, as there will be opportunity of shewing in the next Section, that even the treatise on Heaven and Hell, which gives the main results of Swedenborg's spiritual experience, was not condemned by him. But when he came to find that Swedenborg's writings militated against some of the sentiments that he had strongly confirmed in his own mind; these, which were his interior convictions, gradually threw off the exterior conviction arising from merely outward though miraculous evidence: hence, even before the end of the year 1773, as Mr Houghton afterwards informed Mr Clowes, he inserted in his journal a sarcasm on one of Swedenborg's "Memorable Relations;" and hence he afterwards accepted the false report of Mathesius, and promoted its circulation. Indeed, there can be no doubt that, *then*, such a statement as that of Mathesius would operate as a relief to him; for though he could not receive the whole of Swedenborg's doctrines, the positive proof he possessed of the author's supernatural knowledge must often have disturbed him in his rejection of them: he must therefore have been glad to meet with anything which could make him, with regard to that rejection, better satisfied with himself. Finally, perhaps other causes assisted to strengthen his opposition. When first he published the slanderous report (in 1781,) he still seems to have had some misgivings; hence he pre-faced it with the acknowledgment, that Swedenborg was "*a very great man,*" and that in his writings "*there are many excellent*



ed in that character till he has performed some miracles, then were the Jews fully justified in rejecting the Baptist: for it is expressly said, "John did no miracle."\* Mr Beaumont endeavors to evade this argument by a strange misrepresentation. "As Baron Swedenborg," he observes, with his accustomed wit and elegance, "took upon himself to act the part of a *mighty man of valor* in revolutionizing heaven, earth, and hell, he ought in any wise to have certified his credentials for such a mighty undertaking by a few notable miracles. Moses, who headed a new dispensation, wrought many in the name of the Lord. Jesus Christ, in his own name wrought numberless miracles, signs and wonders. Whilst the Baron, proclaiming himself to be at the head of a dispensation which shall last for ever, does not justify his heavenly mission by even a single miracle! The baron's friends excuse their leader by saying that John the Bap-

*things :*" when he afterwards seemed less inclined to admit so much, although, no doubt, he still spoke sincerely, a little human frailty, perhaps, influenced his judgment. It is well known that Mr W. was always prompt in taking measures to put down anything like rebellion among his disciples,—anything that tended to the diminution of his authority over their minds. Now it is a certain fact, that Mr Smith was not the only one of his pupils who began to think the doctrines of the New Church superior to those of Methodism: among his other preachers who came to the same conclusion, were Mr James Hindmarsh, Mr Isaac Hawkins, and Mr R. Jackson, deceased, with Mr J. W. Salmon and Mr T. Parker, still living; all of whom became active promoters of those doctrines: it therefore is not to be wondered at, that Mr W. at last took the most decisive steps to check their further extension among his flock.

The above appears to me to be a fair and highly probable account of the progress, on this subject, of Mr Wesley's mind. It is not, however, here offered with the view of casting any imputation on his memory. I have little doubt, that, though some erroneous sentiments confirmed in his understanding prevented him from accepting, in this world, the doctrines of the New Church, his intentions were upright, and there was a principle of real good in his heart, which, in the other life would throw off the errors which obscured it, and enable him to receive the truth. This, it is probable, was seen by Swedenborg, and was the reason of his inviting him to an interview: and thus, I trust, though Mr Wesley acted chiefly as an opponent to him while on earth, he may now be associated with him in heaven. Let not then his followers still confirm themselves against Swedenborg's testimony by what Mr Wesley published against him: let them rather weigh, without Mr Wesley's prejudices the reasons he had, and might have had, for coming to a *finally* favorable conclusion; and let them accept the sentiments which, I

\* John x. 41.

tist wrought no miracles. This plea is weak and futile. John was not at the head of a new dispensation; he was the *harbinger*, not the *author* of the Christian religion—the author was the Son of God, ‘*the author and finisher of our faith!*’ ”\* So then it is allowed, that if the Lord Jesus Christ, and not Swedenborg, is at the head of the New Jerusalem-Dispensation of Christianity as he was of the Dispensation of it announced by the Baptist, the performance of miracles is not to be demanded of the *harbinger*; and what a monstrous perversion of truth is it to pretend any otherwise,—to represent Swedenborg as guilty of the atrocious blasphemy of “proclaiming himself to be at the head of the dispensation” which he announces, in the same manner as Jesus Christ was at the head of the dispensation then commenced! or even to claim anything similar for Moses!

But supposing the only reason why John the Baptist did not perform miracles, to have been, because he pointed to another person who did; what could be the reason that the ancient prophets did not perform them? for of all the sixteen prophets, with the Psalmist in addition, there is not one, except Isaiah, of whom any miracle is recorded.† To say that it was necessary for Moses to do miracles because he “headed a new dispensation,” but was not requisite in those who, under the same dispensation, came with divine messages after him. is a “plea weak and futile” indeed. How did the miracles of Moses authenticate the testimony of all who succeeded him? Did their acknowledging his miracles, and living under the dispensation which he was the Human Instrument for introducing, evince that what they delivered was equally true? As well might we say, that because the Pope acknowledges the miracles of Jesus Christ, and lives under the dispensation which he was the Divine Agent in introducing, he possesses the infallibility to which he pretends, and all his bulls are to be received for what they claim to be, the dictates of divine trust, Mr Wesley now holds, instead of adhering to those which he, in all probability, has rejected.

\* Preface, pp. xi, xii.

† Jeremiah predicted the death, within a year, of Hananiah; Daniel, with two *private individuals*, was delivered from the furnace, and alone, afterwards, from the lion’s den: and Jonah was saved by and from the fish: but none of these were miracles wrought by themselves, or of a nature to insure their credit as prophets.

inspiration. Would the Jews have been justified in refusing to admit into their canon more than half the books which we at present find there, because the writers of them did not work miracles? If not, there must be something in the character of every divine communication which carries its own evidence with it; and it must be upon this evidence, and not for outward signs and tokens, that He from whom it comes requires that it should be received. But it will perhaps be urged, that the fulfilment of prophecy, without miracles wrought by the prophet, sufficiently evidences its origin. To a certain extent, this is true: but of what use is this *ex post facto* evidence to those to whom the divine message was first delivered, and whose most important interests frequently depended on their immediately believing it? Besides, though many things contained in the prophetic writings have since been fulfilled, so obscure are they, frequently, in their literal sense, that the learned dispute whether some of them, yea, whether any part of whole books, have been fulfilled yet: and so far from compulsive is even the evidence afforded by the fulfilment of any of them, that infidels, we know, reject the whole together.

As, then, it is incontrovertible, that, even under the Jewish dispensation,—the only dispensation to which miracles properly belonged, it was not usually that the Divine Being authenticated the writings even of his most distinguished prophets by any immediate external token; much less, surely, was it to be expected, that the deliverer of such communications as Swedenborg's, if true, as they purport to be, should appear with a wonder-working rod, and bring in a new age of prodigies and signs. And, in regard, to the evidence which prophecies derive from their fulfilment, we have seen that the testimony of Swedenborg has received an authentication which is fully equivalent and of an exactly similar kind; for that the visible effects of the Last Judgment which he announced, speak as plainly in his behalf, as any fulfilled prophecy whatever.

But let us look a little more particularly at the circumstances attending the introduction of the Mosaic, the Christian, and the Renewed Christian or New Jerusalem Dispensations; and see if we cannot discern satis-

factory reason why miracles accompanied the two former but cannot form proper accompaniments of the last. By what means, then, other than miracles, was it possible for Moses to have accomplished the *external* mission on which he was sent? The Israelites were slaves in Egypt, and in no condition to emancipate themselves by force: by what means then but miraculous ones was it possible to compel the stubborn will of Pharaoh to let them go? All the miracles wrought by Moses, or rather by Jehovah through his almost passive instrumentality (for not one was attempted by Moses but in compliance with a positive injunction), had for their object the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, their preservation in the wilderness, and their introduction into Canaan, as the subjects of a species of political government which has been properly called a theocracy, in which Jehovah himself filled the station of a temporal king: and not one was performed which was not obviously necessary to these purposes. As far as concerned the Jews, external objects alone were in view: and by the miracles wrought, external objects alone were attained: the one were exactly adapted to the other; and, as external performances, to nothing else. That they all represented spiritual things, and are recorded in the Divine Word for our continual instruction, which is the second and higher end designed in them, does not alter their nature as external performances. Having once been wrought and recorded by inspiration, they teach their spiritual lesson for ever; and to convey this benefit it is totally unnecessary that they should be wrought again.

Now who does not see that between Moses, the human Instrument in delivering a people from temporal slavery, —their conductor through a series of temporal wanderings, amid the destitution of a wilderness, to colonize a temporal country,—and the necessary Human Instrument for announcing the truths connected with the second and purely spiritual advent of the Lord; no sort of parallel can exist. All that was done by Moses, was in his situation, and for the immediate natural and remote spiritual objects to be obtained, indispensable; but to require the same works as were done by him of the herald of the Second Advent, would be like requiring of the present inhabitants of England the task of the back-



woodsmen of America; tasks which were necessary when England too was a forest, but which are equally unnecessary and impracticable now that the forest is no more, but meadows and corn-fields occupy its place. For the Jews indeed, who hope again to be gathered from among the nations and re-conducted to the land of Canaan, it is perfectly natural to expect the great prophet who is to deliver them to bear a rod more powerful than that of Moses, and to smooth the road by a series of miracles; having only a natural kingdom in view they are consistent in looking for its establishment, by supernatural means, indeed, but productive of none but natural effects: but for Christians,—for spiritual masters in Israel, who know that their Lord's kingdom is avowedly not of this world, to expect that, at his Second Coming more truly to establish it, he will again send prophets such as Moses to astonish with external prodigies, is to betray conceptions as gross as those of Nicodemus; it is to loathe the manna in comparison of the garlic and leeks, and to sigh again for the carnalities of Egypt.

When, however, God himself appeared on earth incarnate, he was preceded, his coming loudly proclaimed, and the duty of repentance as necessary to prepare for him authoritatively preached, by a "harbinger" who "did no miracle;" but of whom, nevertheless, it is stated, that "all things which he spake of this man [Jesus] were true;"\* plainly enough instructing us, that miracles are by no means necessary to authenticate the most important communications and doctrines; and that a teacher divinely commissioned may point to the Lord, and prepare men to receive him, who does not bring outward signs to prove whence he comes. Nor is the force of this instance at all evaded by saying, that "John was not at the head of a new dispensation;" that "he was the *harbinger*, not the author, of the Christian religion;" and that "the author was the Son of God," who "wrought numberless miracles, signs, and wonders." This argument would be very good, and would make strong against Swedenborg, were it meant to prove and could it prove with truth, what alone it tends to prove, that the design of the miracles, signs, and wonders, wrought

\* John x. 41.

by Jesus, was to induce men to believe the simple preaching of John! But when the fact is the reverse; when, before Jesus had begun to shew himself, there “went out unto John Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins;”<sup>\*</sup> and when, without a previous belief in the simple preaching of John, men could not, notwithstanding the “miracles, signs, and wonders,” be brought to believe in Jesus;† the conclusion is indefeasible, that miracles are not necessary to the authentication of truth: and it will not be easy to deny, that, when they were performed, it was, as to the outward performance, for a very different purpose. But Jesus Christ himself, the great teacher of all, “in his own name wrought numberless miracles, signs, and wonders.” Assuredly he did: for how could God Incarnate do otherwise? When God appeared in a natural body on earth, it was reasonable to expect that his power would be exerted, and his beneficence displayed, in operations extending even to the bodies of his creatures,—that from the person in which he dwelt *virtue must go out*,‡ adapted to operate upon the persons of those, who, by faith in him, were capable of admitting it. But it hence follows, by parity of reason, that at his coming again, not in the flesh but in the spirit, his power would be exerted, and his beneficence displayed, in operations upon the spirits of his creatures,—that the virtue which would then go out from him would be the proper operation of his Holy Spirit, affecting and enlightening the minds of those, who, by their acknowledgment of him should be capable of admitting it. Of what kind, also, were the external miracles which he performed while in the flesh? They consisted almost entirely of cures wrought upon the sick and possessed, and of the sudden production, to support or refresh his creatures, of bread, or of wine. “The blind receive their sight, and the lame

\* Mat. iii. 5, 6.

† “And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, *being baptized with the baptism of John*: but the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves *being not baptized of him.*” Luke vii. 29, 30.

‡ Luke vi. 19.

walk; the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear; the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them."\* Who does not see in these operations, something shadowed out of far more importance than the relief of the body? Who does not behold, in him who wrought them, the Physician of the soul, the Dispenser of spiritual health and life? Who then can doubt that the miracles to be looked for at his spiritual coming, are such, and such only, as those he performed while in the flesh *represented*? that they will consist in the opening of the spiritual eye, or the illustration of the understanding, and the straightening of the spiritual limb, or the restoration to order of the natural mind and life; in the cleansing of the spiritual leper, or of those who, through ignorance, falsify the truth, and the opening of the spiritual ear, or the bringing into obedience of the disobedient will; in the raising up of the spiritually dead, or of those who are dead in trespasses and sins, and the preaching of the gospel to the poor, or the communication to the ignorant of the instructions of the life-giving Word? Thus the miracles wrought by the Lord at his coming in the flesh, by no means lead to the conclusion, that similar miracles must be performed at his coming in the spirit: they in fact prove such an expectation to be unfounded: but they intimate that divine works may then be looked for, as far superior to the former in importance, as the soul is superior to the body.

Still then we find that there was nothing, in the circumstances attending the introduction of former dispensations, that authorizes the expectation of miracles to be performed by the Human Instrument who should announce the last. If, as we see, the external miracles performed by the Lord at his first coming, do not lead to the inference, that he would perform miracles of the same kind at his second; in no degree whatever can they lead to the inference, that such would be performed by his "harbinger." Who will be so mad as to run a parallel between the Lord himself and any Human Instrument whatever? Who then will advance the monstrous false inference; that because the Incarnate God wrought

\* Mat. xi. 5.

miracles in person, the Human Announcer of his second coming should do the same?

But in answer to this it will probably be urged, that the Lord not only wrought miracles himself, but empowered his apostles to do so too. He did so, most certainly; and, in both cases, for the same reason. "The Word was made flesh,"\* and shewed himself to men; and, as the natural consequence, he wrought miracles that affected men's bodies. To extend the knowledge of this fact, he sent forth Apostles; and by them, for the same reason, he wrought similar miracles. To evince "that Jesus Christ was come in the flesh,"† was the main point of their testimony: the burthen of their preaching, was, "repentance towards God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ;"‡ that is, faith that he, who was known on earth by the name of Jesus Christ, was the Word made flesh, was God Incarnate. It was to this that they were to "bear witness."§ There was then precisely the same occasion that "the Word made flesh" should work miracles affecting the bodies of men by the witnesses of the great truth, that the Word *was* made flesh, as that he should do them by his own immediate agency. It still was not the Apostles, but the Incarnate God, who was the sole operator: and the operations in both cases were effects from the same cause, and were but parts of the same whole. To argue, then, from what was done in this way by the preachers of the Lord's advent in the flesh, to what ought to be done by the Human Instrument for announcing his advent in the spirit, is again to draw a complete false inference. The legitimate conclusion is directly the reverse. We have seen that there must be the same difference between the operations produced at the Lord's second coming and at the first, as there is between the whole nature of the second advent and of the first. We have seen that as it was agreeable to order that the Lord at his coming in a human body should perform cures on the human bodies of men, it would be contrary to order that he should do the same at his coming in the spirit and power of his Word, but that then the internal operations should

\* John i. 14. † 1 John iv. 3. ‡ Acts xx. 21.

§ John xv. 27, Acts i. 8, 22, iv. 33.



take place of which the external were figures. We now see that it was agreeable to order that the preachers of his coming in the flesh should do similar miracles to those which he performed himself. Would it not then be a palpable violation of all order, that the announcer of his spiritual coming should do such miracles as were performed by those “who companied with the *apostles* all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among *them* ;”—and were “ordained to be *witnesses* with *them* of his resurrection?”\* Is it not a most clear requirement of order and consistency, that the miracles to be performed by the announcer of the Lord’s coming in the spirit and power of his Word, should be such, as the Lord Himself will alone then perform? miracles relating solely to the illumination of the understanding and the rectification of the heart, and which cannot appear as miracles before the outward eye? These are only to be performed by instruction in genuine truths drawn from the Holy Word: and of such instruction, by such truths, there is ample store in the writings of Swedenborg. These are found, by the humble and sincere, efficacious to the performance of genuine miracles. The restoration of sight to the naturally blind is productive of less delight, than many have experienced in the enjoyment of that clear light of truth, which, through the instrumentality of those writings, has burst on their mental sight. Through their means, the spiritually lame has leaped as a hart, and the tongue of the spiritually dumb has burst out into singing; for through their means, notwithstanding the state of desolation into which the professing church of the day has declined, in the wilderness waters have broken out, and streams in the desert.†

Again then we see, from all the circumstances attending the introduction of former dispensations, that there is no reason whatever for supposing that the Human Instrument appointed to announce the last, should accompany his announcement by the performance of natural miracles; on the contrary, they afford the most conclusive grounds for presuming that the time is completely gone by in which the performance of miracles could form any part of the divine economy.

\* Acts i. 21, 22.

† Isa. xxxv. 6.

But, further: who that frees himself for a moment from the shackles of prejudice, and allows himself to think from judgment, and from a regard to the present state of mankind, does not see herein the wisdom of the Almighty? Who is there that seriously believes, that a dispensation ushered in by miracles would be at all suited to the present state of the world? Does any one actually think, that a man who should appear working miracles, would at this day obtain any serious attention? When miracles were literally performed, it was among a people to whose habits of thinking they were congenial. The Jews scarcely looked upon miracles as things extraordinary. Among a people then of such a turn of mind, it is reasonable to suppose that some of the messengers of Jehovah would be authorized to gratify the popular expectation by miracles. But if, as is certain, to the performance of miracles, a disposition to acknowledge their reality is necessary in the persons among whom they are wrought; if, as is certain, the incredulity of his countrymen was capable of restraining the wonder-working energies of the Saviour in person;\* who can imagine that, in these times, in this age of incredulity, Divine Wisdom would rest its communications on such a basis? Would not, in these days, a man working miracles be treated as a mountebank? And would he be respected much more, even by those who believed his miracles to be real? Would not the cures he might perform be resolved into collusion, or, where this was proved to be impossible, be imputed to the agency of unknown natural causes, or of that power which modern infidelity has invested with omnipotence,—the more than magic power of imagination? It may be affirmed, that a repetition of the miracles of the Saviour himself would at this day, and in Christian countries, obtain but little attention: they were all such as might either be denied altogether or imputed to one of the above causes: and if *he* did not choose to silence his numerous gainsayers by the more terrible prodigies of Moses, we cannot suppose that he would cause such interruptions of the course of nature to be produced by the herald of his

\* “And he could there do no mighty work, save that he laid his hands on a few sick folk, and healed them.” (Mark vi. 5.)

second advent. Indeed, it may be doubted whether even the prodigies exhibited by Moses would now be believed. Were a modern teacher to conduct an army from Calais to Dover, few, probably, would be convinced, by any testimony, that they had marched through the sea. Many, in fact, who would be loth to be thought infidels, confess as much. Even they who are loudest in demanding miraculous evidence, often, almost in the same breath, admit its inefficacy in altering the principles of a man's religious belief: while they object to Swedenborg that he did no miracles, they inform us, that they would not have believed him if he had. Thus the celebrated Dr Priestley, after having said a good deal on the indispensable necessity of miracles to authenticate a divine commission, at last overturns his whole argument by this ebullition of Unitarian firmness: "Should any being, in the complete form of an angel, tell me that God had the form of a man, and that this God was Jesus Christ, I should tell him that he was *a lying spirit!*"\* And the Rev. W. Roby, relying on the stability of the decrees which Calvin has framed for the Almighty, affirms, that "even miracles themselves could not confirm the truth of Swedenborgian doctrines."† What inconsistency! to call upon us to authenticate our doctrines by miracles; and then acknowledge that they agree with us in thinking that miracles are not proper evidences of doctrinal truth!

This sentiment,—that miracles are not the proper evidences of doctrinal truth, is, assuredly, the decision of the Truth itself; as is obvious from many passages of Scripture. We have seen that the design of the miracles of Moses, as external performances, was, not to instruct the Israelites in spiritual subjects, but to make them obedient subjects of a peculiar species of political state. And though the miracles of Jesus Christ collaterally served as testimonies to his character, he repeatedly intimates that this was not their main design, and that they were only granted, in this respect, in accommodation to the hardness of Jewish hearts: and he condemns

\* *Letters to the Members of the New Jerusalem Church*, p. 60.

† *Anti-Swedenborgianism*, &c. p. 27.

and laments the gross state of the people that could require them. He even says to a disciple, in reference to his own manifestation of himself after his resurrection, "Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed:"\* clearly teaching, how superior is the state of mind which can see truth without external evidences, above that which demands them. So when the nobleman of Capernaum besought Jesus to heal his son, though he complied, he answered, in terms expressive of displeasure at such requirements, "Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe."† At another time, more plainly still, he says, that it is "a wicked and adulterous generation (that) seeketh after a sign;"‡ on which occasion, according to Mark, "he sighed deeply in his spirit."§ How characteristic is that touch of the Apostle, "The Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom!"|| (where by wisdom he means the elegance and refinement of Grecian literature :) may we not say, that, generally speaking, these Jews and Greeks are well represented by the religionists and persons indifferent to religion of the present day? Even, then, while performing miracles, it is evident that the Divine Energist did not regard them as the proper evidences of spiritual truth, and conceded them, thus far, with reluctance. Hence, likewise, he so often commanded those on whom his miracles were wrought to keep them secret ;¶ a proceeding which would be unaccountable indeed, if he meant them as proofs of the truth! For the evidence of truth he taught men to look at the truth itself, and to the witness it finds to itself in the duly prepared heart. He does not say, "If any man see a miracle, he will know that the doctrine taught by the operator is of God;" but, "If any man *will do his will*, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God."\*\*

\* John xx. 29.

† John iv. 48.

‡ Matt. xvi. 4, xii. 39, Luke xi. 29.

§ Ch. viii. 12.

|| 1 Cor. i. 22.

¶ Matt. viii. 4, ix. 30, xii. 16 xvii. 9, Mark v. 43, Luke v. 14.

\*\* John vii. 17.



But Truth Itself carries still farther its disownment of miracles as its proper evidences. Although the Lord, at his advent in the flesh, did signs and wonders in condescension to the hard-heartedness of the Jews among whom he appeared, he never intimates that either he or his messengers shall repeat such signs at his second coming; on the contrary, what is quite conclusive, he seems thenceforth to relinquish them to the powers of darkness. Thus, in reference to the time of his second coming, he says, "There shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew *great signs and wonders*; insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect."\* So Paul, illustrating a prophecy of Daniel, notices a wicked one to be revealed, "whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and *signs*, and *lying wonders*."† So the Apocalyptic Divine, speaking of the second beast, says that "he doeth *great wonders*,—and deceiveth them that dwell on the earth by means of those *miracles* which he had power to do."‡ And in another place he mentions "the spirits of devils" as "*working miracles*."§ Is it not then evident, that, after the time of the Lord's advent in the flesh, no miracles were to be expected, but such as might be wrought, or pretended to, in attestation of error? It is probable, indeed, that by the miracles here predicted we are not to understand outward miracles, but a certain power of fascinating the mind as if by enchantment, on those who yield to its influence, which always accompanies deeply infernal delusions: yet very extraordinary outward occurrences also, very strongly testified, are recorded in the annals, not only of Catholicism, where they are most abundant, but of many protestant sects: however, be the nature of the predicted diabolical miracles what it may, miracles they are called: is it not then certain, that, had Swedenborg wrought any, all the texts just adduced would have been cited by his adversaries, and his performance of the signs which are now demanded, would then have been urged as infallible tokens that his mis-

\* Matt. xxiv. 24.

† 2 Thes. ii. 9.

‡ Rev. xiii. 13, 14.

§ Chap. xvi. 14.

sion was from Satan?\* Has not then the Spirit of God "done all things well," in that, after having predicted no future miracles but infernal ones, it has omitted to decorate the Human Instrument for communicating its last discoveries with those questionable insignia?†

\* This has been done in regard to the extraordinary instances of the reality of his communication with the spiritual world which have been given in a former note. The author of "the Trial of the Spirits," &c. speaking of some of these as adduced by Mr Hindmarsh in his "Letters to Dr Priestley," &c. calls them "instances of supernatural knowledge, and proofs of a power of command in the world of spirits, which are not a little surprising; and adds, "there seems to be no possibility of denying their truth as to facts." (P. 13.) But he argues from it, "That a power of working apparent miracles, or *prodigies*, may, on some occasions, be permitted to *evil spirits*, and their wicked instruments." These facts, however, though proofs of Swedenborg's supernatural knowledge, were not miracles, but natural consequences of the state in which he was placed, and which was required to enable him fully to see the correspondence between spiritual things and natural, and to qualify him for giving that information respecting the state after death, the ignorance of the human mind respecting it at the present day, makes above all things, desirable and necessary.

† Wishing, as far as possible, to avoid, in this appeal, repeating what has been said before, I have not, in the above statement of reasons why no miracles were performed by Swedenborg, dwelt much upon those offered by Swedenborg himself, and which have been most urged by his vindicators. I thus have not urged the most important of all,—their tendency to close the rational mind. To make the subject more complete, I will therefore here subjoin an extract from an address drawn up by me for a certain occasion (but not used) in the year 1799; at which time I had not read anything on the question but what is contained in our author's own writings, with which I had become acquainted the preceding year. There is more warmth in the manner than I should now use; but this the reader will excuse in a youthful production; written too at a time when the delight accompanying the perception of new truths was in all its freshness, and when I literally was filled with astonishment that what appeared to me clearer than the light of the meridian sun should not be seen by others.

"Some, probably, will say, 'What argument can induce us to believe a man in a concern of this nature who gives no visible credentials to his authority? A teacher commissioned from on high ought to have the power of working miracles. Had we seen him raise a dead corpse to life, or jump unhurt from the monument, we might have believed him; but without such proofs as these, we cannot.' But let us ask in return, Is it worthy of a being wearing the figure of a man to require such proofs as these to determine his judgment? Are we not endowed with rationality? Is it not by virtue of this celestial spark that man boasts himself a man, and claims

I trust then that all the Candid and Reflecting will agree with me in the conviction, that Swedenborg, by

superiority over every other rank of animated nature? The lower orders of creation have bodily senses as well as we: they can see, hear, feel, taste, and smell: and if we, refusing to exercise those faculties which we possess in common with angels, receive only such evidence as our external senses can grasp; do we not degrade the dignity of our nature, deny our heavenly origin, and reduce ourselves to a level with the beasts that grovel on the ground? The beasts act from the impulse of their bodily senses, but are utterly incapable of seeing from reason why they should so act: and it might easily be shewn, that while a man thinks and acts under the influence of a miracle, he is as much incapable of perceiving from any rational ground why he should thus think and act, as a beast is.

“‘What!’ our opponents will perhaps reply, ‘Dare any one speak thus disrespectfully of miracles, when they are sanctioned by the testimony of the Bible? Was it not entirely by miracles that the Jewish Church was established? Was it not by miracles that the Israelites were induced to believe Moses? Was it not by miracles that they were governed in the wilderness? And was it not by miracles that the prophets [some of them] testified their authority? Do you not believe these facts?’—Yes, my friends, I do most entirely believe them: and at the same time I most ardently hope that none of us are such people as the Jews were; because the most stupendous miracles would then do us no more good than they did them. For can we have a more conclusive evidence of the inadequacy of miracles to convince a man to his real benefit, than in the conduct of that people; who, notwithstanding the wonderful things which they daily saw, were continually rebellious, insomuch that, we are informed, they were stiff-necked above all the people on the face of the earth?—‘If then the Jews were not amended by those means, what end did they answer?’—Let us consider what end was answered in their being introduced into the land of Canaan: for how can we suppose that a people of this character ever constituted a real, spiritual church?\* And how can we imagine that they could ever be, in a peculiar manner, the express favorites of God?—‘But if not, why did he interpose in so wonderful a manner to deliver them from Egypt?’—We answer; They were delivered from Egypt, which was a type of the natural state of man, and introduced into Canaan, which was a type of his spiritual state, that they might represent all that belongs to a real spiritual church by their ceremonial worship and particular transactions; and that, by their means, a revelation might be given to the world, which, in its literal sense, should treat of their affairs and of those of the neighboring nations, their wars, rites, and customs; all which spiritually signified such things as relate to the real spiritual church: and because they could not be brought even to represent such a church by superior inducements, they were driven and forced to it by miracles; which, likewise, were all representatives of spiritual subjects.

\* See what is said on this subject in “the Plenary Inspiration,” &c. p. 404 to 444.

the non-performance of miracles, has in no degree weakened his claims to attention, but that he would have

“But it may be objected, ‘That supposing the Jews were a gross, external people, who did little more than represent a spiritual church, the Christian was an interior dispensation; and yet miracles were wrought at its establishment, both by Christ and his Apostles.’—But let us remember, that the Lord passed his whole life upon earth among the Jews, who, being such a people as has just been described, required testifications of this sort; which here also, as well as in the case of the miracles wrought by Moses, had a spiritual signification. Besides, the Word of the New Testament, wherein they are recorded, was yet to be written: and every sickness and infirmity therein described to have been healed, was representative of some evil or false principle which only the divine power of the Lord is able to remove. If this were not the reason, why is not this power continued to the dignitaries of the church till this day? We see that it is not: we find that, as soon as the Christians were entirely separated from the Jews, miracles ceased.

“But now, at the opening of a more interior dispensation than either of the former,—of a more spiritual form of the everlasting gospel,—no miracles are performed at all. Is not the reason yet evident? Let me ask any person whatever, whether he can be forced to think what he does not think, or to love what he does not love? It is true that, by the civil laws of a state, or anything which occasions fear, a man may be forced to speak what he does not think, and to do what he does not love; yet, notwithstanding this, he does not think and love what he thus says and does; and, were the constraint removed, he would immediately speak and act otherwise. Now, though such conduct as this may indeed answer the purposes of the civil life, do we not see that, with respect to the spiritual life, it is nothing? A man may, by civil and ecclesiastical enactments, be restrained from speaking against the truths of religion and outwardly transgressing its laws; yea, he may be, and in some countries is, forced to acknowledge and obey them: yet if his knowledge and obedience proceed only from such a cause, what is his religion? It is evident, that unless a man really thinks what he speaks and loves what he acts, there is nothing of the man in such speech and action. Hence it may appear, that the essential human principle, or that by virtue of which man is man, consists in the liberty of thinking and willing; and that if this liberty were taken from him, which would be the case were he constantly under the influence of a miracle, he would no longer, properly speaking, be a man at all. If we see a beast of prey destroy another animal, do we reprobate him as guilty of moral evil? No we do not: we are sensible that he is gratifying a natural appetite, which he has no liberty of will to resist. But if we see a man commit an act of cruelty or injustice, we do reprobate him as guilty of moral evil: we are sensible that reason might have taught him it was wrong, and that he was at liberty, had he pleased, to obey her dictates. If then we thus confess it to be these faculties which raise us from mere animals to men, how ought we to disdain to seek an influence, which, by depriving us of them, would reduce us from men to mere animals! And such is the influ-



weakened them much more had he wrought the most "notable" ones. Even under the Mosaic law, abound-

ence of miracles. For if, when we have rejected a truth, the operation of a miracle force us to acknowledge it; is there anything of true faith in such acknowledgment? True faith must reside in the rational mind: but the miracle, acting only on the external senses, actually shuts up the rational mind: so that, astounded in a stupid amaze, we become utterly incapable of looking at what is thus forced upon us in any light of reason, or of receiving it in any affection. Wherefore the miracle becomes quite useless: for finding ourselves, while its impression remains, deprived of our freedom,—bereaved of the faculties which constitute us men,—we willingly suffer it to wear off: and thus being restored to our liberty, we confirm anew what *our* reason dictates; we return to our former belief; because it is what we think, and what we like to think. But that we may see this as clearly as possible, let us take an example. Suppose a man, having no affection for goodness, to be forced by a miracle to acknowledge a truth which he otherwise would reject: will he behold this truth with pleasure, even though it teach the way to happiness? Assuredly not. And why? Because he wishes to find happiness some other way. For this (inasmuch as it is a truth) teaches, that, to be truly happy, we must be good, and renounce the pursuit of such enjoyments as are grounded in the love of evil: but he, being devoted to the pursuit of such enjoyments, which he feels as his very life, will regard as an enemy whatsoever opposes it. Finding himself therefore under an irksome restraint in the prosecution of his favorite pleasures, from the monitory voice of the truth he has acknowledged, he will shortly reject it as founded in error; and he will deny the miracle which induced his belief, by persuading himself that it was the accidental effect of some natural cause with which he is unacquainted; or perhaps, that it proceeded from the agency of powers which delight in deceiving mankind.

"Let us then not wish to have our minds closed by miracles, but let us open them by rational investigation. If we are desirous to know whether the doctrines now promulgated are consistent with truth, let us search for them in Moses and the prophets; for these are they which testify of them; and if we believe not Moses and the prophets, neither should we be persuaded though one rose from the dead. These are the Lord's own words; which I remind you of, to evince, that the reasons I have offered to demonstrate the inutility of miracles as evidences of spiritual truth, are derived from Him who cannot err. Let us remember that he also assures us, that it is an evil and adulterous generation which seeketh after a sign. Let us remember likewise, and tremble lest we resemble them, that the Jews, who were such a generation, were not convinced by the signs when they beheld them. Of this, what an awful instance they gave when they crucified the Lord! 'Come down from the cross,' they cried out, 'and we will believe thee.' Did he not perform the miracle they demanded as the condition of their faith? Nay, did he not perform a much greater miracle? He raised his glorified body from the grave: the Jews knew it:—and they bribed the guard to say that it had been stolen by his disciples!

*and I think I remember to have seen in the*

ing, as that dispensation did, with outward wonders, the performance of them is never laid down as among the credentials of a prophet; while, on the other hand, their exhibition by false prophets is spoken of as possible and probable: "If there arise among you a prophet or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign or a wonder, and the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods which we have not known, and let us serve them; thou shalt not hearken unto the voice of that prophet, or that dreamer of dreams."\* Thus the knowledge of God, as revealed, of course, in his Word, is spoken of as the only infallible touchstone. So in Isaiah: "To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because they have no light in them."† To the same purpose is the wise answer of Abraham in the parable: "They have Moses and the prophets: let them hear them.—If they hear not Moses

"No, my friends, believe me! it is not by miracles that disciples are to be gained for the New Jerusalem. The real inhabitants of this 'holy city' are to be *interiorly* principled in wisdom and goodness: and it is not in the power of a thousand miracles to affect the interiors of the mind, or to remove one evil which is rooted there. Let us then remember we are men, and look for such evidences as become the capacities of men; which are, truths that recommend themselves to an enlightened reason: and of these rational evidences there is no lack to accredit the testimony of Baron Swedenborg."—

See also some remarks upon the unsatisfying nature of the evidence from miracles in the preface to "the plenary Inspiration," &c. I had there said, in reference to those defences of Christianity which build chiefly on that evidence, that they "are more adapted to *silence than to satisfy* even an ingenuous inquirer." The observation has been cavilled at by some of the Reviewers; but I have since had the satisfaction of finding precisely the same idea, in nearly the same phrasology, expressed by Mr T. Erskine, in his very popular work, "Remarks on the Internal Evidence for the truth of the Christian Religion."—"We generally find," says that amiable writer, "that the objections which are urged by sceptics against the inspiration of the Bible, are founded on some apparent improbability in the detached parts of the system. These objections are often repelled by the defenders of Christianity as irrelevant; and the objectors are referred to the unbroken and well supported line of testimony in confirmation of its miraculous history. *This may be a silencing argument, but it is not a convincing one.*" (p. 200, Ed. 1823.)

\* Deut. xiii. 1, 2, 3.

† Ch. viii. 20.

and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.”\* And the Lord himself: “Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me.—Had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me.”† It is to this testimony that Swedenborg appeals. As the “harbinger” of the Lord at his first advent preached of, and pointed to, the Word made flesh, and they who thence were led to Jesus acknowledged, that, though “John did no miracle, all things that he said of this man were true;” so does the herald of the second advent point to the Lord in his Word, and they who, guided by his directions, seek him there, will assuredly find, that, though Swedenborg did no miracle, all that he has said of the presence of the Lord therein, in the power and glory of its spiritual sense, is true also. And the one is as great a divine discovery as the other. As it was impossible for John, without illumination from above, to have known in his true character the Word in person; so was it impossible for Swedenborg, without illumination from above, to have known the true character of the written Word of God, to have seen how it makes a one with the living Word himself; being a derivation from him in the inmost of which he is, and by the opening of the internal sense of which he is bringing himself nearer than ever to mankind, and granting to them a nearer access to him. It would be idle, I admit, to talk in this manner, if the views of Scripture given in the writings of Swedenborg differed not from those of commentators in general,—if they contained nothing beyond what learning and study and piety might discover: but if they exhibit far more than this; if they present the Word in a light completely new and transcendently glorious; if they prove that it includes throughout a regular spiritual sense, which, without superseding that of the letter, immensely exalts and dignifies the whole, displaying it to the enchanted eye of reason as well as of faith as the very Divine Truth and Wisdom,—as, without a figure, the Word of God indeed; then surely it will be conceded, that flesh and blood could not have revealed this unto him, but he must have received it by special illumination from the living Word himself.

\* Luke xvi. 29, 31.

† John v. 39, 46.

Why is this not generally seen? Because Christians in general now, like the Jews at the Lord's first advent, have their minds pre-occupied with erroneous conceptions respecting spiritual subjects: because, as the Jews were possessed with gross but darling notions respecting the earthly kingdom of the Messiah and the perpetual carnal observation of the ceremonial law, and thus were disqualified for relishing the spiritual things which he declared were contained in that law; so Christians are possessed with external but fondly cherished sentiments respecting all the great points of the religion of Jesus, and with the persuasion that it is to continue unaltered, as professed by them, till the end of the world; and are thus disqualified for relishing the truly heavenly doctrines and really spiritual ideas which are now shewn to be contained in the Word of God. Perceiving, on a slight inspection, that the views presented by Swedenborg oppose their prejudices, few take the trouble to make themselves sufficiently acquainted with his writings: to be able to form anything like a correct judgment respecting their truth and credibility: yet, I apprehend, even the most prejudiced will hardly deny, that the spiritual sense opened by his instrumentality, if true, is a discovery of such importance as to be worthily referred to God. But let us hope that the reign of prejudice, though it has lasted long, will soon, in this as in so many other instances, be broken down. The Lord at his coming in the flesh was crucified; no wonder then that, when appearing again in the opening of a higher order of Truth in his Word, he should be rejected: but as he then rose again, and from his throne in heaven extended his reign over multitudes who then began to acknowledge him, so, doubtless, the hour is coming when an influence from himself in heaven will accompany his Word as opened,—when the prejudices which oppose its reception will be abolished from the minds of multitudes,—and when they will again “look upon him whom they have pierced,” and accept the truth they have denied. Begin then, I intreat you, ye Candid and Reflecting, to use the freedom which, by the accomplishment of the last judgment, is restored to the human mind. Suffer, in your own breasts, the power of prejudice to reign no longer. Take the pains fairly to



estimate the views of, and from, the Word of God presented by Swedenborg, not rejecting the whole as soon as you find something that differs from your previous opinions, or that you do not immediately understand: and the result, I trust will be, that you will find them, as compared with the Word of God, testifying their own truth by evidence far more convincing than that of miracles, because by evidence that does not merely strike the senses, but reaches the understanding, and affects the heart. Then you will see that the illustrious Swedenborg must indeed have been the Human Instrument for communicating the great truths connected with the second coming of the Lord. If, with any degree of candor, you look at his character and writings without admitting this, you will find the whole an inexplicable riddle. His writings, you will see, are far too replete with superior views of Divine Truth to be the productions, in its ordinary state, of the human mind; in addition, you will perceive, that they are far too methodical in their form, too soberly as well as sublimely rational, to be the imaginations of a lunatic; and, in further addition, you will acknowledge, that their excellent moral tendency, together with the eminently amiable and virtuous character of their author, render ridiculous the notion, that they can be the offspring either of wilful imposture or of diabolical illusion. What remains, but that you accept them as the result of divine illumination,—the communications of a writer who had really been called to a holy office by the Lord? Admit this, and the mystery is solved. You will be satisfied, that this much calumniated and much mistaken man was as consistent and exalted a character as was ever known: you will confess, that having been selected as the Human Instrument for announcing the last great dispensation of gospel-truth, though differing from former similar Instruments as much as this differs from former dispensations; and being “not disobedient unto the heavenly vision;”\* he pursued the course appointed him with as much steadiness and consistency, self-devotion and zeal, as marked the career of a Moses or a Paul; and your hearts will

\* Acts xxvi. 19.

tell you, that, like them, he deserves to have his memory for ever embalmed in the grateful recollections of mankind.\*

---

## SECTION VI.

### *Heaven and Hell; and the Appearances in them and in the Intermediate Region or World of Spirits.*

IF the character of the illustrious Swedenborg, as the divinely selected Human Instrument for announcing the second coming of the Lord, and for communicating the discoveries of Divine Truth to be then afforded, be satisfactorily established; and if the reality of his intercourse, in that character, with the spiritual world, be

\* The impossibility of explaining the character of Swedenborg upon any other hypothesis than that which admits the truth of his pretensions, has been tacitly acknowledged by some of his Reviewers. The Monthly Review, for instance, though it has sometimes indulged an ill placed levity in regard to Swedenborg's writings, yet on the first publication, in English, of his treatise on Heaven and Hell, which is precisely the work of his which may most easily be distorted into matter of ridicule, spoke of the Author in the following tone of moderation: "Count Swedendorg (so it styles him) is certainly to be ranked among the wonders of the age: for though enthusiasts and visionaries have arisen at all times, it is very rare to meet with one who so *calmly*, yet confidently, and with so much simplicity and *cool reasoning*, relates the frequent interviews he has had with the world of spirits." The Reviewers then give an extract from the book; after which they say, "In whatever light we regard this author, *there is something truly astonishing in him and in his writings*. He was a man of eminence and distinction in his country;" &c. continuing to relate much that was honorable in his character, and concluding with an extract from the translator's preface, exhorting to the perusal of his works. (M. R. Nov. 1778.) In their account of the work entitled "The New Jerusalem and its Heavenly Doctrine," after a sort of abstract of its contents, they say, "Possibly, when the doctrine here taught is stripped of its peculiar garb, it will be found to mean nothing more than that real piety integrity, and goodness of heart, *which all good men must plead for, and earnestly wish to see universally prevail*.—We will only add, that while we cannot but consider the late Count Swedenborg as an Enthusiast of the first order, we must also regard him as *a most extraordinary*, and, indeed, *a most wonderful man?*" (M. R. Vol. lxiii. App.) We here see precisely the same feeling as the force

confirmed, as we have seen it is, by indubitable proofs of his supernatural knowledge; all the objections which are made against him on account of the particulars brought to light by him respecting the hitherto unknown state of man after death, fall at once to the ground. If those particulars are in harmony with his general system of doctrine, and his general system of doctrine, including that part of it which relates to this subject, is securely founded on the Scriptures, it is the height of absurdity to reject them, and with them the whole of his system, because they clash with some unfounded prejudices of our own. Most men avow, that, in regard to all which relates to the life of man after death, beyond the simple fact that he continues to exist, they are involved in the deepest ignorance: yet offer them any specific information on the subject, and they reject it as untrue, with a decision which would only be justifiable were they already in possession respecting it of the most accurate knowledge. Supremely interesting to an immortal as is the nature of the state on which he enters at the death of the body, the opposers of the New Church act as if it were here a high privilege to be in the dark. Allow me then now to appeal to you, my Candid and Reflecting Readers, on this much misrepresented and much misunderstood part of our Author's testimony and writings.

of truth, by another of its distinguished proclaimers, excited in one of old, whose previous habits had in like manner disqualified him for receiving it, but who, while under its influence for a moment, could not refrain from exclaiming, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." (Acts xxvi. 28.) The previous habits of the Monthly Reviewers, together with the character they had to maintain, constrained them to speak of Swedenborg as an enthusiast; while the force of truth compelled them to admit, that he was *such an enthusiast as the world had never before seen*. What could have made them say, "*In whatever light we view this author, there is something truly astonishing in him and his writings?*" What, but an inward feeling, though not acknowledged to themselves, that no other hypothesis could explain the phenomena of his case but that which the author himself assigns? without which his character and writings must ever remain an inexplicable riddle, calculated to generate all that astonishment which attends the combination of contradictions? what more extraordinary contradiction than to talk of a CALM and COOLLY REASONING *enthusiast*' WHOSE DOCTRINE, too, is such as all good men must earnestly wish should become universal,—that is, is the ESSENCE OF REASON AND EXCELLENCE?

I. It is we are well aware, (and it may be expedient, first, to meet that objection with a few remarks,) a great offence with many in this Sadducean age, that our Author should profess to have had open communication with the spiritual world; to have been so in the spirit,—and this, as he declares, not when he was asleep but when he was wide awake,—as to be able to communicate with those in the world of spirits, or the first receptacle of souls after death, and occasionally with those in heaven and with those in hell; as also, to behold the appearances which exist in all those places and states respectively.\* But what is there in his pretensions on this subject, which is not sanctioned by the experience of those who have formerly filled a similar office? Did not the Apostle Peter behold as extraordinary a vision as any that is detailed in the “*Memorable Relations*” of Swedenborg, when he beheld “*a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet, knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth; wherein were all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air. And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter, kill and eat.*”† Does not the Apostle Paul declare, that, to him revelations from heaven were things of common occurrence? He says,—and *states it among his claims to respect and attention, not as what ought to involve his pretensions in doubt and denial,*—“*I will come to visions and revelations of the Lord. I knew a man in Christ, [meaning himself,] about fourteen years ago (whether in the body or out of the body*

\* It was this which the writer of this Appeal found most repulsive, when first, by the kindness of Providence, the writings of Swedenborg came into his hands. Accustomed, as is so commonly the case at this day, to consider the other world and this to be separated by an impassable barrier, I could scarcely believe it possible for an inhabitant of the natural world to have any open communication with the spiritual,—not even by the special gift and providing of the Lord. Hence I at first ridiculed what I read (for the first book I opened was the treatise on Heaven and Hell), beautiful, sublime, and affecting, as were the views presented. But examining further, the superior views on all the subjects of religious doctrine which the writings of Swedenborg everywhere exhibit, and the luminous explanations they offer of the Word of God, entirely convinced me, that, in these respects he was truly an enlightened and safe guide.

† Acts x. 11, 12, 13.



I cannot tell; God knoweth;) such a one caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man (whether in the body or out of the body I cannot tell; God knoweth;) how that he was caught up into paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not possible for man to utter. Of such a one will I glory.—And lest I should be exalted above measure through *the abundance of the revelations*, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan, to buffet me, lest I should be exalted above measure.”\* Communications with the spiritual world, then, were common with the apostles, and were regarded by them as properly belonging to their office: and specific examples of them abound throughout the Scriptures both of the Old and New Testament. So, if we are to give any credit to the unanimous assertion of all the primitive fathers, similar communications were extremely frequent in the early ages of Christianity. But, without adverting to these, the possibility of such communications cannot be denied by any believer of the Scriptures. Surely then we may say, that, standing in the situation in which Swedenborg asserts he did, he would have been but half qualified for his work had he been without them. His pretending to them does not, indeed, afford proof that his other pretensions are true; but it makes the whole consistent, and thus it gives to the whole the character of higher probability. In him, as the instrument for restoring the true knowledge of religious truth, they were entirely in place. Without them, all that he advances besides would have lost half its claim to attention. And if the information communicated by him is far more distinct than had ever been made known on such subjects before, this, also, is precisely what, under the circumstances, was to have been expected. If the knowledge respecting life and immortality brought to light at the first promulgation of the gospel, greatly exceeded in clearness what the world previously possessed; it surely was to be expected, that the knowledge on the same subjects unfolded at the Lord’s second advent, would rise in distinctness above that communicated at his first, in the same ratio as this transcended the mere shadows afforded under the Mo-

\* 2 Cor. xii. 1 to 5, 7.

saic dispensation. Is it then the part of sound reason to reject the information communicated, for being what, if true, it assuredly ought to be? Is it the part of sound judgment to conclude, respecting Swedenborg, from the mere fact of his asserting that he had such communications with the spiritual world, as, if his pretensions were true, he ought to have had, that therefore his pretensions were false? We surely cannot justly come to such a conclusion, till, after having weighed all that he offers as the result of his communications in the balances of Scripture and Reason, we have found them wanting.

II. To induce a condemnatory decision respecting the subjects of Swedenborg's spiritual intercourse, the author of the *Anti-Swedenborg* has brought together, as before observed, such a collection of *Sundered Scraps* as he deemed most likely to make an unfavorable impression on the reader: and he prepares for them by a Section headed *On Heaven and Hell*; in which he states, in his own way,—that is, in the way he thinks best calculated to generate prejudice,—such particulars as will most easily admit of misrepresentation. To create odium, he imputes to us on a former occasion, as noticed above,\* the denial of “a future reckoning day and an hereafter of rewards and punishments;” so now, for the same purpose, he falsely represents us as abolishing the difference between heaven and hell. “The Baron,” he affirms, “by his descriptions of the invisible world, has gone a great way towards making those who will believe him, neither very anxious for heaven, nor much afraid of hell, which, wherever such a feeling obtains, is a dreadful mental disease. For the sanctions of rewards and punishments do mightily restrain from vice, and promote virtue and piety. We are all naturally too remiss in religious duties: there is therefore little need to bereave us of those two great stimulants, *hope* and *fear*.”† So then, Swedenborg deprives virtue and vice of their sanctions:—a serious charge indeed, were there a grain of truth in it! To be “*afraid of hell*,” however, in its most proper sense, is to be *afraid of evil*; for though *hell* is a place and state of misery, the essence of it is *evil*. The *fear of hell* which is not accompanied

\* P. 66.

† P. 67.

with the *fear of evil* is but a spurious and Pharisaic kind of feeling, productive of little benefit either to the individual or to society. A man may be *afraid of hell* in the manner recommended by Mr B.,—even of “*the Mahometan’s hell*,” the description of whose terrors he quotes, (for he here again refers, for the third or fourth time, to his favorite standard of orthodoxy, “*the Mahometan’s Creed!*”)—without being much *afraid of evil*: and Mr B. seems desirous to evince this by his own example; for surely it is no light evil continually to sin, as he does, against the commandment, “Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.”

That any man who has ever looked into Swedenborg’s treatise on Heaven and Hell, and by making references to it, as Mr B. has done, wishes it to be believed that he has read it, should be capable of advancing such a calumny as to say, that the Baron’s descriptions of the invisible world tend to make men neither very anxious for heaven nor much afraid of hell; to take away from virtue and vice the prospect of reward and punishment; and to deprive men of those stimulants to good conduct, hope and fear; is truly a deplorable example of the power of theological prejudice; for, most assuredly, never before was heaven represented under so truly attractive, exalted, and glorious an aspect; never was hell depicted so morally appalling, so repulsive by *credible horrors*.

Is there nothing calculated to render us anxious for heaven,—to make us regard it as a reward of virtue desirable in the highest degree,—in the assurance offered by Swedenborg, that he who enters heaven comes into a scene, where every object that can impart delight salutes his new-quickened sensations; while yet it is not in anything imparted by outward objects that his happiness essentially consists, though they contribute to its fulness, but in that ineffable sense of blessedness which fills his whole mind, and which is inherent in that life of love, wisdom, and use, by which he is inwardly animated, and into the full activity, and completely developed enjoyments of which, he now finally enters? He is immediately, according to our Author, surrounded by kindred angels, all ready and eager to shew him the most winning offices of attention, and in whose society he feels at once

entirely at home, as if he were among friends and relatives known to him from infancy; whence his spirits expand, and his life is exalted, being conjoined with the life of all around him; which being all in harmony with his own, and not the slightest disagreement creating an opposing or uncongenial sphere to be felt, occasions such a sense of fulness of delight, as can never here be experienced, nor even conceived. Nor can any description ever exalt the imagination even to the threshold of the state requisite for apprehending it; for it can only be apprehended, as it is, by those in the spiritual state belonging to angels, and which cannot be perceptibly communicated to man in the natural world. Of man in his natural state it will ever be true, as Divine Truth hath spoken, that "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him." Nor does the experience of our author form any exception to this statement; for it was not to the faculties of his natural part, by which he lived as a man in the world, that the experience was communicated, but to those of his spiritual part, which properly belongs to the spiritual world; and he constantly declares that he can give no description of what it was thus granted him to perceive, that can convey any adequate idea of it to man in the world: all that he sketches therefore, and all that we can apprehend, is to be regarded but as a faint approximation to the reality. But we must not attempt to enter into particulars here. Let those who feel sufficient interest in a subject interesting above all others, consult our Author's work on *Heaven and Hell*; and if they do not, on a serious examination, find his representations of the heavenly state to be heavenly indeed; to be, to the truly rational and justly feeling mind, pre-eminently attractive: and to bear so distinctly the stamp of truth as to indicate that they could only have been derived from positive knowledge; we will admit that he has no higher claim to superior illumination.\*

\* Let any one turn in particular to the chapters on *the Wisdom of the Angels of Heaven*, on *the State of Innocence of the Angels of Heaven*, on *the State of Peace in Heaven*, and on *Heavenly Joy and Happiness*; and it may surely be affirmed, that if anything can affect him, and awaken in his bosom any heavenward aspirations, he



And if they who believe the testimony of Swedenborg have reason to be animated in the highest degree to

will find it there. I select a few passages, that the reader may see how easy it would be to make a collection of Extracts from Swedenborg's works that would powerfully recommend them to the pious and sincere.

“The angels can express by a single word what a man cannot express by a thousand words. Besides, in one angelic expression are conveyed things innumerable, which cannot be expressed by the words of human language; for in every individual thing uttered by angels are included arcana of wisdom in continual succession, to which human sciences cannot reach. The angels also supply by the tone of their voices, what they do not express fully by the words of their speech; and in the tone of their voices is contained the affection belonging to the things of which they speak in their order: for by the tones they express affections, and by the words the ideas of thought flowing from their affections. Hence it is that the things heard in heaven are said [by the Apostle Paul] to be ineffable.” (H. and H. n. 269.)

“It is said in heaven, that innocence dwells in wisdom, and that the angels have wisdom in proportion as they have innocence. That this is the case, they confirm by these considerations: That they who are in a state of innocence attribute nothing of good to themselves, but consider themselves only as receivers, and ascribe all to the Lord: that they are desirous to be led by him, and not by themselves: that they love everything which is good, and are delighted with everything which is true, because they know and perceive that to love what is good, thus to will and to do it, is to love the Lord, and that to love what is true is to love their neighbor: that they live contented with what they have, whether it be little or much, because they know that they receive as much as is profitable for them, little if little be profitable, and much if much: and that they do not know what is profitable for them, because this is known only to the Lord, who hath a view to what is eternal in all the operations of his providence.”—“All who are in the good of innocence are affected by innocence, and so far as any one is in that good, so far he is affected. But they who are not in the good of innocence, are not affected by it: wherefore all who are in hell are altogether contrary to innocence, nor do they know what innocence is; yea, they are of such a character, that in proportion as any one is innocent, they burn with a desire to do him mischief.” (n. 278, 283.)—“The inmost principles of heaven are two, viz. innocence and peace. They are termed inmost principles, because they proceed immediately from the Lord. Innocence is that principle from which is derived every good of heaven; and peace is that principle from which is derived all the delight of heaven. Every good is attended with delight: and both good and delight have relation to love; for whatever is loved is called good, and is perceived as delightful: Hence it follows that those two inmost principles, innocence and peace, proceed from the divine love of the Lord, and affect the angels from an inmost ground.”—“The divine sphere of peace in heaven flows from the Lord, and exists in consequence of his con-

secure the joy that is set before them, they are instigated, by the clearest conviction of the eternal wretched-

junction with the angels of heaven, and in particular in consequence of the conjunction of good and truth in every angel. These are the origins of peace : whence it may be evident, that peace in heaven is the Divine Sphere inmosty affecting with blessedness every principle of good there, thus, acting as the source of all the joy of heaven ; and that in its essence it is the divine joy of the Lord's divine love resulting from his conjunction with heaven and with every one there. This joy, perceived by the Lord in the angels, and by the angels from the Lord, is peace. Hence, by derivation, the angels have every blessedness, delight, and happiness ; or that which is called heavenly joy." (n. 285, 286.)

"Every one may know, that when man leaves the external or natural man he comes into the internal or spiritual ; whence it may be known that heavenly delight is internal and spiritual, but not external and natural ; and since it is internal and spiritual, that it is purer and more exquisite, and that it affects the interiors of man, which are the faculties of his soul or spirit."—"The delights of heaven are ineffable, and likewise are innumerable. But of those innumerable delights not one can be known or credited by him who is in the mere delight of the body or of the flesh ; since his interiors look away from heaven and towards the world, that is, backwards. For he who is wholly immersed in the delight of the body or of the flesh,—or, what is the same thing, in the love of self and the world,—has no sensation of any delight but what is to be found in honor, in gain, and in the pleasures of the body and the senses, which so extinguish and choke interior delights, which are those of heaven, that their existence is not believed. Wherefore a person of this description would wonder greatly, if he were only told that there are delights existing when the delights of honor and gain are removed ; and still more if he were told, that the delights of heaven succeeding in their place are innumerable, and are such, that the delights of the body and the flesh, which are chiefly the delights of honor and gain, cannot be compared with them. Hence the reason is evident, why it is not known what heavenly joy is."—"All the delights of heaven are conjoined with and are in uses, because uses are the goods of love and charity, in which the angels are principled ; wherefore every one enjoys delights of such a quality as are his uses, and likewise in such a degree as is his affection for use."—"Heavenly joy itself, such as it is in its essence, cannot be described, because it has its seat in the inmost principles of the life of the angels, and thence in every particular of their thoughts and affections, and from these again in every particular of their speech and actions. It is as if the interiors were fully opened and expanded to the reception of delight and blessedness, which is diffused into all the fibres, and thus through the whole angel ; whence its perception and sensation are such as to admit of no description : for what commences from the inmost parts, flows into all the parts derived from them, and propagates itself, with continual augmentation, towards the exteriors. Good spirits, who are not as yet in that delight, because not as yet raised up into heaven, when they perceive it emanating from an an-

ness which awaits the wicked and impenitent, to shun the paths which lead to its abode. They are assured in the most decisive manner, that the state of those who are inwardly wicked,—who are *confirmed*, in principle as well as in practice and inclination, in the evil dispositions of their corrupt hearts,—will be hereafter intensely miserable; since the increased activity of perception peculiar to those in a spiritual state of existence, whilst it incomparably augments the felicity of the good, must proportionately increase the unhappiness of the bad. We are assured, also, that not only are the inward feelings of the wicked hereafter full of pain and misery, but that, although they are not unceasingly roasted in material fire, without which Mr B. would fain have it believed that hell cannot be hell, yet actual inflictions of punishment inconceivably severe, and often reiterated, also await them in the dark world; these being the only means by which their malignant natures can be restrained from breaking forth into such outrages as would disturb the

gel by the sphere of his love, are filled with such delight, that they fall as it were into a swoon through the sweetness of the sensation.”—“That I might know what is the nature of the delights of heavenly joys it hath been granted me by the Lord to perceive them; wherefore, since I have had living experience, I can know, but not at all describe them: yet something shall be said to give some idea of them.—It was perceived that the joy and delight came as from the heart, diffusing themselves with the utmost softness through all the inmost fibres, with such a sense of gratification, that the fibre is, as it were, nothing but joy and delight; and in like manner every perception and sensation thence derived, receiving its life from happiness. The joy of bodily pleasures, compared with these joys, is as a gross and pungent clot compared with a pure and most gentle aura. It was observed, that when I was desirous to transfer all my delight to another, a more interior and fuller delight than the former flowed in its place; and it was perceived that this was from the Lord.” (n. 395, 398, 402, 409, 413.)

I know not how these extracts may impress the reader, but I venture to think that every one may in some measure judge of his own spiritual state, according as he is *affected* by them or not; and that whosoever is *affected* by them will be of opinion, that they are in the highest degree worthy of the subject, and that heavenly wisdom, innocence, peace, and joy, could only be so well described by a communication from heaven itself. If any should still think, with Mr B. that such views of *heaven* are calculated to make a man *not very anxious* to attain it,—that they deprive *virtue of its prospect of reward*, and bereave us *of the stimulant of hope*, an obviously true solution of the enigma, but a most awful one, is given in the extracts themselves.

peace of the good, and even endanger the subsistence of the universe. According to Swedenborg, all who are in hell can feel no enjoyment but in the doing of evil; yet no sooner do they attempt it than they fall into punishment. Their existence is thus passed in alternations between two states; in one of which they are in the sense of the privation of all delight, in consequence of being withheld from doing such things as alone are delightful to them,—and this in addition to that turbid wretchedness which lusts such as theirs, even when enjoying their gratifications, carry within them; and in the other they are suffering the positive tortures of punishments inconceivably dreadful. This is the hell of which Mr B. declares he should not be much afraid!\*

\* It may be satisfactory to the reader, if we illustrate this subject also by a few extracts from our Author's treatise on *Heaven and Hell*.

“Evil spirits are severely punished in the world of spirits, that by punishments they may be deterred from doing evil. This likewise appears as if it were from the Lord; when yet there is nothing of punishment from the Lord but from evil itself. For *evil is so conjoined with its own punishment, that they cannot be separated*. For the infernal crew desire and love nothing more than to do evil, especially to inflict punishment and torment; and they likewise do evil, and inflict punishment, on every one who is not protected by the Lord; wherefore, when evil is done by any from an evil heart, since this rejects from itself all protection from the Lord, infernal spirits rush in upon him who does it, and punish him.”—“What eternal fire is,—which is mentioned in the Word as the portion of those who are in hell, hath as yet been known scarcely to any one, by reason that mankind have thought materially respecting the things mentioned in the Word, not being acquainted with its spiritual sense; wherefore by this fire some have understood material fire, some torment in general, some the pangs of conscience; and some have supposed that it is mentioned merely to impress the wicked with terror.”—“The spiritual heat appertaining to man is the heat of his life, because in its essence it is love. This heat is what is meant in the Word by fire; love to the Lord and neighborly love being meant by heavenly fire, and self-love and the love of the world by infernal fire.”—“Since the lust of doing evils, which originate in the love of self and of the world, is what is meant by infernal fire; and since such lust possesses all who are in the hells; therefore, likewise, when the hells are opened, there is seen a sort of fiery appearance with smoke issuing from it, such as is usually seen from buildings on fire.—But when they are closed, this fiery appearance is not seen, but in its place an appearance like a dark mass of condensed smoke.—It is however to be noted, that they who are in the hells are not in fire, but that the fire is an appearance;—for love corresponds to fire, and all things which appear in the spiritual world



### III. In the *general* views then which are presented in the writings of Swedenborg on the subject of Heaven

appear according to correspondences.”—“As by infernal fire is meant every lust to do evil flowing from the love of self, by it is also meant torment such as has place in the hells. For the lust derived from that love is the lust of hurting others who do not honor, venerate, and pay court to the subject of it:—and when such lust prevails in every one, in a society which is restrained by no external bonds, such as the fear of the law, and of the loss of reputation, of honor, of gain, or of life, every one, under the impulse of his own evil, rushes upon another, and, so far as he prevails, enslaves the rest and reduces them under his dominion, and from a principle of delight exercises cruelty towards those who do not submit.—All the hells are such societies; wherefore every one there carries hatred in his heart against another, and from hatred bursts forth into cruelty, as far as he prevails.”—“But as rebellious disturbances continually exist there, since every one there desires to be greatest, and burns with hatred against others, hence come new outrages. Thus one scene is changed for another: wherefore they who were made slaves are taken out to help some new devil to subjugate others; when they who do not submit, and yield implicit obedience, are again tormented by various methods. And so they go on continually. Such torments are the torments of hell, which are called infernal fire.” (n. 550, 553, 566, 568, 573, 574.) Beside these general miseries, in the first volume of the *Arcana Cœlestia* are described a number of specific inflictions which follow the perpetrators of various crimes.

Now can anything be conceived more truly horrible than such a state as this;—to be incapable of any delight but in doing injury to others, and to have the injury thus done speedily return upon their own heads? But some are offended that delight, under any form, should visit the breasts of infernals: yet every observer of human nature well knows that even the most atrocious crimes are attended with delight to those who are in the love of them, and that nothing is more true than the observation of our Author, that whatever a man loves he regards as good, and feels as delightful. Thus one well acquainted with the human heart represents Satan as exclaiming,

“Evil, be thou my good!” P. L. iv. 110.

Again, he makes Satan justly express the nature of evil, and its delight, in the following lines:

“The more I see  
Pleasures about me, so much more I feel  
Torment within me, as from the hateful siege  
Of contraries. All good to me becomes  
Bane, and in heaven much worse would be my state.—  
For *only in destroying find I ease*  
To my relentless thoughts.” B. ix. 119, &c.

The same character speaks of his aim as being

“—all pleasure to destroy,  
*Save what is in destroying: other joy*  
To me is lost.” Ib. 477. &c.

and Hell, as the abodes, respectively, of happiness and of misery, while there certainly is not anything which is not in the highest degree agreeable both to Reason and Scripture, there also seems nothing which could be deemed inconsistent with the usual conceptions of the Christian world. I have therefore not thought it requisite to dwell upon the general subject further than was necessary to refute Mr Beaumont's unjustifiable calumny; that heaven, according to our Author's representation of it, is not to be desired, and hell not to be feared. In forbearing to enlarge upon these subjects, I am well aware that I am foregoing a great advantage; for the views we entertain of them only require, I am sure, to be fully and fairly exhibited, to win the admiration and charm the effections of all candid and reflecting aspirants for heaven. But my aim in this Appeal is, to recommend our views of the eternal world and state, and our doctrines of faith and life, not so much by the direct presentation of their obvious beauties, as by the vindication of those points which have been most assailed by objectors, because they most differ from the common apprehensions of the Christian world. Now some of the particulars brought to light in the writings of Swedenborg respecting Heaven, Hell, and the Intermediate Region or World of Spirits,—some of the circumstances relating to their inhabitants, and to the appearances which are there presented to the view,—certainly do widely differ from the commonly received apprehensions. It is by these then that such adversaries as Mr Beaumont chiefly hope to make an unfavorable impression on their readers; with which view they set them forth in an isolated manner, separate from the explanations of their causes which the Author gives in various parts of his works, which, when seen, though they do not bring the statements objected to nearer to the common apprehensions, evince the common apprehensions to be founded in mistake, and establish the agreement of all the Author's statements with Reason and Scripture. The explanatory truths then necessary to the right understanding of the subject, I propose here to offer; and nothing more will be necessary to vindicate every relation which our adversaries would stigmatize as unfounded or ridiculous.

In order to see the reasonableness and Scripture

ground of the seemingly most extraordinary of the particulars stated by Swedenborg respecting the inhabitants of heaven, hell, and the spiritual world in general, and the objects and appearances which there exist, only these two general truths are necessary to be known: *First*, That man after death, though no longer clothed with a material body, is no less a real and substantial man than before: and, *Secondly*, That all things which exist before the sight in heaven, hell, and the intermediate state or region, are appearances, expressing and outwardly exhibiting, according to the laws of the immutable analogy or correspondence that exists by creation between spiritual things and natural, the state, ideas, and inclinations, of those who dwell there.

With respect to the *first* of these general truths, sufficient proof, I apprehend, to satisfy any mind open to conviction may have been given above in our Section on the Resurrection; where we found that the Apostle Paul expressly teaches, that there is a spiritual body as well as a natural body; and where it appeared that all the testimony of Scripture upon the subject treats this spiritual body as the man himself,—as a real substantial existence, which rises in eternity immediately after death. Mr B., however, quotes as ridiculous, Swedenborg's account of this matter: I will adduce the paragraph in which the difference is stated between man in the other world and man in this, and leave you to judge, whether, instead of its being ridiculous, it is not rational in the highest degree. His words are, "The difference between a man in the natural world, and a man in the spiritual world, is, that the latter is a man clothed with a substantial\* body, but the former with a material body, within which is his substantial body; and a substantial man seeth a substantial man as clearly and distinctly as a material man seeth a material man; a substantial man, however, cannot see a material man, nor can a material man see a substantial man; by reason of the difference between what is material and what is sub-

\* The author uses the terms *substantial* and *substance*, in the logical sense of *that which subsists by itself and sustains accidents*: but he confines it to spiritual subsistences as distinct from material, because the latter do not exist of themselves, but from the former; as do these from the Lord, who is the veriest substantial Being of all.

stantial, the nature of which difference may be described, but not in a few words.”\* Now, that this is the true representation of the matter, may be scripturally proved from all the accounts of the visions of the prophets. Did John the Revelator see the wonderful things that he describes with the eyes of his body ? Does he not begin his revelations with saying, “ I was in the spirit on the Lord’s day ? ” † In this state it was that he first heard behind him “ a great voice as of a trumpet,” and that, on turning round, he “ saw seven golden candlesticks, and in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man.” † When he was *in the spirit*, he was in his *spiritual or substantial man*, and it was with the eyes and senses of this that he witnessed all that he afterwards describes. And that this idea is as agreeable to reason as to Scripture, is evident from the opinions of many intelligent and pious persons, who have been convinced of its truth by their own reflections. I will mention here one testimony of this sort : it is that of Mrs Fletcher, the widow of the late celebrated Mr Fletcher, the pious and every way accomplished Vicar of Madeley. The life of Mrs Fletcher, which was published from her own papers a few years ago, has been very extensively read among religious people: and in it this intelligent and excellent lady thus speaks of the state of man after death. She entertained the full belief, that though separated from her husband, so far as death could separate, her union and communion with him still remained; and she thus expresses her ideas, in answer to objections made to them, partly in the very language of Swedenborg. “ Is not [the objecter is supposed to ask] the spirit divested of the body become of a quite different nature to what it was before, so as to be incapable of the same feelings? I answer, Certainly no; the spirit is the *man*. The spirit of my dear husband loved and cared for me, and longed above every other desire for my spiritual advancement. Now if it were the body, why doth it not love me still? You answer, Because it is dead. That is to say, the spirit is

\* Tr. Chr. Rel. n. 793 ; Beaumont, p. 123,

† Rev. i. 10.

‡ Ver. 10, 12, 13.



gone from it: therefore, that which loved me is gone from it. And what is that but the spirit, which actuated the body, as the clock-work does the hand which tells the hour? It therefore appears quite clear to me, that every right affection, sentiment, and feeling of mind, we have been exercised in here, will remain in the spirit just the same *immediately after death.*”\* Now if many believe this to be true when they read it in Mrs Fletcher, why do they deride Swedenborg as an enthusiast for saying the very same thing? Our opponents will say, “Because she gives it only as her opinion: he delivers it as a truth which he could testify from experience.” This does not make it less true, at any rate. But I might add, that Mrs F. also gives us experience on the subject, both of her own and of others.†

\* P. 195. 8vo. ed. 1818.

† I extract the following vision, which she relates (p. 227) as an indubitable fact, of a woman whom she calls “that dear old saint, Mary Matthews.” This good woman having awaked under an extraordinary influence early in the morning, on getting up and coming down stairs, relates what happened to her thus: “All around me seemed God! It appeared to me as if the room was full of heavenly spirits.—Falling back in my chair, I remembered no more of any thing outward, but thought I was at the threshold of a most beautiful place. I could just look in:—The first thing I saw was the Lord Jesus sitting on a throne. There was a beautiful crown over his head. It did not seem to bear with a weight, but as if it was suspended there, and as he turned his head it turned with him. A glorious light appeared on one side, and all around him was glory! I thought of that word of St Paul,—Who dwelleth in light unapproachable. Turning my eyes a little, I saw close to my Saviour my dear minister, Mr Fletcher. He looked continually on the Lord Jesus with a sweet smile. But he had a very different appearance from what he had in the body, and yet there was such an exact resemblance, that I could have known him among a thousand. Features and limbs just the same, but not of flesh. It was what I cannot describe, all light! I know not what to call it: I never saw anything like it. It was, I thought, such a body as could go thousands of miles in a moment. There were several passed who had the same appearance: and I seemed to have lost my old weak shaking body. I seemed to myself as if I could have gone to the world’s end, as light as air. I looked on him a long time, and observed every feature with its old likeness. He then turned his eyes on me, and held out his hand to me, just as he used to do. After this, the whole disappeared, and I came to myself.”—I offer no opinion of this vision, but I suppose that all the people called Methodists, and most pious persons, will admit it to have been something real. Yet here we have an account of man’s retaining his identity after death, and ex-

Are we not then entitled, from the whole, to say, that, according to the evidence of Scripture, the conclusions

isting in a spiritual and yet substantial body, that exactly accords with the statements given by Swedenborg.

Having here had occasion to make use of the testimony of Mrs Fletcher, I will take the opportunity to correct the false impression that might be made by a passage in her life (p. 377), and to establish the assertion, that "among the believers of Swedenborg's spiritual intercourse, if not of the whole of his doctrine, is certainly to be reckoned the celebrated and eminently pious Vicar of Madeley, the Rev. Mr Fletcher;"—a man who was far the brightest ornament that Methodism ever possessed, if indeed, his religion *was* that of Methodism; for certainly, though he used the doctrinal forms of Methodism, he, in many respects, penetrated beyond the mere appearances of truth according to which they are framed, and soared into the light of the genuine truth itself, being elevated into it by the purity of his affections. It is also certain that Mrs Fletcher, at one period, approved, at least, of much of Swedenborg's writings. This is evident from the quotation given above, as well as from other testimony: for those beautiful sentiments are in substance, and partly in expression, the same as are given by Swedenborg in his treatise on Heaven and Hell; and they were written by her *just after she had been reading that identical work*. But her mind was greatly under the influence of Mr Wesley, who, as we have seen, exerted himself, after he had been imposed on by Mathesius, to prevent the reception among his people of the doctrines of the New Church; and this may account for the paragraph which appears in her printed journal under the date of March 5, 1806, *more than twenty years after Mr Fletcher's decease*. But there are some who can hardly believe that that paragraph, as it stands, though it makes favorable admissions, ever proceeded from her pen. It begins thus: "A thought has struck my mind, That from some things mentioned in the notes subjoined to the Portrait of St Paul, edited by Mr Gilpin, after my dear husband's death, he might be thought to favor the opinions of Baron Swedenborg, I therefore think it my duty to bear my witness to the contrary."—What Mr Gilpin had said on this subject, I have not ascertained, not having been able to obtain a sight of the first edition of the work; and the passage has been so carefully erased from the subsequent editions, that not a syllable respecting Swedenborg is in them to be found. Mrs F. proceeds: "*The first book which he saw contained but little amiss: and Mr Wesley having observed concerning it, 'I think it will neither do good nor harm,'—Mr Fletcher, soon after writing to his brother, who had mentioned it, observed, that it was a book which he did not condemn.*"—*Now this book, which Mr Fletcher did not condemn, which Mrs Fletcher allows to contain but little amiss, and which Mr Wesley did not think capable of doing any harm, was the Treatise on Heaven and Hell: and that is a work of no neutral character; for its details being constantly given as the results of the Author's personal knowledge and experience, not to condemn them is to acknowledge it to be at least highly probable, that he wrote from divine illumination. And that work not only contains the Au-*

of the intelligent, and the experience of the pious, the testimony of Swedenborg, upon this subject, is most cer-

thor's views respecting Heaven and Hell, and the Life after Death in general, but it touches, either directly or incidentally, upon the whole of his doctrines; in particular, it devotes two chapters to the explanation of the correspondence between spiritual things and natural, and advances throughout the great doctrine on which all the others hinge,—that of the sole divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ. If then Mr Fletcher did not strongly favor the whole, would he have encouraged his brother, for whose spiritual welfare he felt the most tender solicitude, to study such a work, by telling him “it was a book which he did not condemn?”—Mrs F.'s journal adds, “But when he had seen a little more of the Baron's works, he said to me one day, ‘Polly, I believe Mr —— will be a Swedenborger, and I am very sorry for it.’ I said, well, if he can believe there are wax candles and feasts in heaven, he must have strange ideas. Mr F. replied, ‘My dear, thou dost not perceive the snake in the grass. These books deny the atonement, and so strike at the root of all true religion.’ In the same mind he continued to the last.” It is here very strange that Mrs F. should have made the remark about wax candles in heaven; *for no such statement is anywhere made by Swedenborg.* That Swedenborg's works do not deny the atonement as represented in the Scriptures, will be seen in the next Section but one; and it seems scarcely possible that Mr F. should have thought so. And that he esteemed Swedenborg's works injurious, and *continued in that mind to the last*, is utterly irreconcilable with the certain fact, that *one of the last acts of his life was, to introduce those works to a beloved friend, who is living at this day, and blesses his memory, for having been brought by him to a knowledge of those invaluable writings.*

The following is from a letter of Mrs M. Walker, of Bath, to a lady in London, dated May 10, 1820. The original is before me. “I do not remember ever to have read any passage put forth by a public religious character with feelings of more surprise and astonishment, than one lately put into my hand by a friend, who is a lover of truth. The passage alluded to is in Mr H. Moore's *Life of that late very dear and venerable mother in Israel, Mrs Fletcher*, and is relative to Mr Fletcher's opinion and sentiments on the invaluable writings of Emanuel Swedenborg; *for which*, I have from *undoubted and united* testimonies been convinced, that *both Mr and Mrs F. entertained much respect*, if they did not fully appreciate their worth. When young, I was honored by *intimate* acquaintance with both those distinguished and pious characters; and I for some years corresponded with the above lady, both as Miss Bosanquet and Mrs Fletcher. The last time I had the pleasure of addressing her, my letter was conveyed to her hands by William Gilbert, Esq., a native of Antigua; in which I informed her that I had embraced the doctrine of the New Jerusalem Church, requesting her sentiments thereon. On this gentleman's return to Bristol, I naturally and ardently expected her reply: But to my great disappointment Mr G. informed me, that Mrs F. had requested her kind love, and hoped I would excuse her not writing, as the weak state of her eyes prohi-

tainly true? Man after death is still a man,—a real man in a substantial yet spiritual body, though no longer in a material body, as while here.

bited her doing it. I then inquired if she had made no remark relative to E. S. Mr G. replied, that she had conversed freely with him on that subject, and said, that she could always see a great difference in his writings according to the station he described himself as standing in, or receiving his instructions from;—for instance, when he wrote from the *east*, she could perceive more of the spirit of the Lord to be in it than when from any other quarter, when she considered what he wrote as coming from some spirit or angel, and sometimes from himself.” [It is to be observed, that Swedenborg never describes himself as standing in, or receiving what he wrote from, different quarters: this then is only Mrs Fletcher’s mode of describing the difference she thought she perceived in his writings; but she herein adopts as true what he states respecting the difference of the quarters in the spiritual world, and the arrangement of its inhabitants therein according to their states; according to which representation, the east is where the Lord himself appears, and they are stationed towards the east who are eminently principled in love to him. But Mrs F. here fully acknowledges her belief, that Swedenborg really did receive communications from the spiritual world, and frequently, even, from the Lord, though she falls into the inconsistency of supposing, that he who was thus the channel of divine and heavenly communications, was equally the channel of very inferior influences, and was himself unable to distinguish the one from the other! The fact is, she saw that the reality of his spiritual intercourse could not be denied, nor the exalted excellence of many of his views; but cherishing herself some erroneous sentiments, she made these the standard of her judgment, and so ascribed to an imperfect source whatever in his writings was inconsistent with them.] —“Now,” Mrs Walker proceeds, “as this dear lady always from my earliest years expressed a strong affection for me, and, had my father been willing, would have taken me home as her own daughter (being then in Bath, about the year 1766 or 67,) it is most probable that a woman of her sweet heavenly spirit would have warned me against reading or receiving doctrines which she considered *dangerous*, had she seen them *in such light*: which she might have done verbally, if unable to write, by Mr Gilbert. — Again: I do not recollect the year, but at the time the Rev. Melville Horne went to Sierra Leone, leaving Mrs Horne behind on account of her advanced state of pregnancy, Mrs H. spent about ten days with me; and I experienced great delight in her conversation and communications of spiritual sentiments, not without surprise at finding them so congenial with my own. One day, on her making some spiritual remark which I knew did not grow in the old church, I said, ‘My dear Mrs Horne, you can say, *Shibboleth!* — where did you gather your last sentiment from?’ ‘From Madely,’ she replied, ‘from dear Mr Salmon.’ I then inquired if she had ever conversed with Mr Fletcher on those doctrines: to which she replied in the affirmative, and that he appeared to esteem them so highly, that she inquired why he did not preach them in his church. His reply she gave me



We proceed to prove the *second* general truth necessary to our seeing the reasonableness and scripture ground

in the following remarkable words: '*Because my congregation is not in fit states to receive them.*'"

Mrs Walker then relates what she had heard respecting Mr Fletcher from J. W. Salmon, Esq. of Nampton; but having myself been favored with a letter from that gentleman detailing the particulars more fully, with leave to publish them, I give them on his immediate authority. His letter to me is dated July 2, 1825: and in it he says as follows: "In answer to your inquiry, I state the following particulars for certain, which took place betwixt Mr Fletcher and myself the last time I had the pleasure of passing a couple of days with him at Madeley, which was but a few months before his death. After receiving me with open arms into his house, he thus addressed me: 'My dear brother, (which he always called me,) I am glad to see you, and hope we are once more met to enjoy a heavenly feast together.' After this he went into his study, and brought the Baron's treatise on Heaven and Hell, and laid it on the table before me, saying, 'There, my dear brother, is a book, the contents of which will just suit your taste; and as I am particularly engaged for two or three hours every day about this time, in finishing a controversial work of some importance, you will excuse my leaving you so hastily, and amuse yourself with reading a little in the book I have brought you, which I believe will be agreeable to your present state of mind.' He then left me: and being greatly impressed with the manner of his introducing the book to me, I fell upon my knees, and devoutly prayed, that if the truths contained in the book before me were likely to make me more holy and heavenly minded, I might be prepared to receive them, and live accordingly. Then rising from my knees, I opened the book, and, passing over the preface, I read about thirty pages, and was deeply impressed with the whole of them, but more than words can express with the declaration, that the Lord Jesus is the only God of heaven and earth, and the only Object of true Christian worship. Just after being thus divinely impressed, Mr Fletcher came into the room, and thus addressed me: 'Let me now ask you, my dear brother, how you like the Baron?' To which I replied, 'Who can do otherwise than like him? I never met with such a book in my life. He discards a trinity of persons in the Godhead, and makes the Lord himself to be the only God of heaven and earth. I should be glad to peruse the whole book, if you can conveniently lend it me.' To which he replied, 'I will lend it you with great pleasure, and desire you will make any marginal notes on it you think proper.' He further said, that *he regarded the Baron's writings as a magnificent feast, set out with many dainties, but that he had not an appetite for every dish.* He not only declared this to me, but I have frequently been informed he said the same to others. What books of Swedenborg's he was acquainted with besides the treatise on Heaven and Hell, I cannot say; but I should think he was well acquainted with the contents of that; as he told me that he intended to write a treatise on the science of correspondences; and from that book, I have often thought, he gained the knowledge of that long lost and

of the particular facts respecting the appearances in the other world which are stated by Swedenborg. That general truth is, That all things which exist before the sight in heaven, hell, and the intermediate state or region, are appearances, expressing, and outwardly exhibiting, according to the laws of the immutable analogy or correspondence that exists by creation between spiritual things and natural, the state, ideas, and inclinations, of those who dwell there.

It is a fact which was well known in ancient times, though it has long been lost sight of, that there does

most important science." — Here then we see whence he acquired that extraordinary talent for opening the spiritual sense of the Scriptures, by which, Mr Gilpin assures us, he was so distinguished. — Mr Salmon then mentions how he was struck by Mr F.'s manner of praying. He always began with "Dear Lord Jesus;" from which, and from a passage in his Pastoral Letters, p. 103, Mr S. concludes, "that our Incarnate God and Saviour was the grand Object of Mr Fletcher's faith and worship." Mr S. adds, "Let me not forget to acknowledge, that Mrs Fletcher sent to me for the book, saying, that as her dear husband was gone into the other world, she wished to see the account of that world given by the Baron. — What her sentiments were respecting the Baron's writings, I cannot say, as she never was present in the few conversations I had (respecting them) with her husband."

The fact then must surely now be admitted, to be amply established, — that Mr Fletcher is to be reckoned among the believers of Swedenborg's spiritual intercourse, if not of the whole of his doctrine; and, however the strange passage came into her journal, the same fact appears to be true in respect to Mrs Fletcher also, though, probably to a less extent. Would such a man as Mr Fletcher have introduced writings to his friend, with the anticipation that that friend would approve of them, if himself thought them the offspring of delusion? Would he have permitted his friend to express his high approbation of the leading doctrine of those writings without checking his ardor, if himself deemed that doctrine untrue? The thing is impossible: and the similar reflection which Mrs Walker makes respecting Mrs Fletcher's conduct to her, is equally well founded. To Mr F.'s remark, "that he regarded Swedenborg's writings as a magnificent feast, set out with many dainties, but that he had not an appetite for every dish," the same observation is applicable as to Mrs Fletcher's notion, that our Author wrote at times from the Spirit of the Lord, and at other times from inferior spirits or from himself: only Mr F. does not ascribe what he less approved to any fault in the things themselves, — for he compares the whole of those writings to a feast, and all their contents to dainties, — but to the state of his own appetite; modified, as this necessarily was, by the views of doctrine which he had imbibed in early life, and through the fallacy of some of which he was only beginning to penetrate when he was taken away.

exist, by the very first laws of nature and of creation, a constant mutual relation between spiritual things, or such as relate to the mind and its perceptions, and the objects which appear in outward nature; which is such, that natural things answer to spiritual by an unalterable, fixed, and most exact analogy or correspondence, so that in every natural object an image of some spiritual thing or principle is to be seen. Thus, who does not know, without any one to inform him, that light is an exact image of truth; darkness, of ignorance and of falsehood; fire, of love? And if some natural things thus clearly answer to certain spiritual things who can doubt that all natural things do the same, and that such correspondence is essential to their nature? \* Now in heaven and hell there cannot be any really *natural* things; but instead of the things themselves there are appearances of them, and such as exactly answer to the state, ideas, and inclinations, of those around whom they appear. Hence, many of those things which appear as real to the wicked, have no existence but in their own phantasy, and are mere illusions of their sensual imaginations. An idea of this may be formed from the case of insane persons, and of such as labor under extremely severe nervous disorders, in the world: These, as is well known will often imagine that they see and are annoyed by different appearances, and even experience severe pains in the body, when the whole is the mere illusion of the imagination, though its effects to them are the same as of the most solid reality. Now all in hell are absolutely insane. Rationality can never exist in a state of separation from goodness and truth. In its genuine state it is the offspring of the heavenly marriage of those two principles. In the world, men, even though wicked, are kept in some outward regard to the principles of goodness and truth for the sake of their characters in society, and also are held in a state of rationality by the Lord, that their reformation may be possible: but such rationality does not reach to their internal part or spirit,

\* See this proved in the work on the Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures. See it shewn also in Kirby and Spence's *Introduction to Entomology*, Vol. i. pp. 11, 12, 22, 23, Vol. iv. pp. 401 to 410: or see the *Intellectual Repository*, Vol. ii. (N. S.) pp. 131, &c.; where the passages are extracted.

when the truly internal man,—the apostle's "inward man which delights in the law of God,"—is closed: it is put off at death together with their external part; and as they then come into their internal, which is in the infernal marriage of evil and falsehood, they become also actually insane; although, as is often the case with the insane in this world, they become in the highest degree cunning, and skilful in malicious artifices.

Now that the objects which appear to sight in the spiritual world are appearances of such objects as are seen in the natural world, and that these are all representative of spiritual things, is perfectly evident from all the relations of the kind which are to be found in the Word of God, and which are there very numerous. To take an example which alone is sufficient to establish the fact. When forces were sent to seize Elisha the prophet, and his servant was greatly intimidated at the danger, we read thus: "And Elisha prayed and said, Lord, I pray thee open his eyes that he may see: And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man, and he saw: and behold the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha."\* Here were appearances of objects similar to those of the natural world, seen when the eyes of the spirit of Elisha's servant were opened: consequently, the objects seen were really in the spiritual world, and not in the natural world. But who can imagine that there are real horses and real chariots in heaven, or in any part of the spiritual world? What then were these but appearances representative of the sphere of Divine Protection with which the prophet was surrounded? The prophet, doubtless, being the immediate agent of God, was in consociation with the angelic world, and in the midst, as to his spirit, of guardian angels: but his servant did not see the angels themselves, but appearances representative of the defence and protection, which, by the ministry of angels, surrounded him from the Lord. A hundred other instances might be mentioned, but I will confine myself to a few. We read in Zechariah, That he saw a man riding on a red horse among the myrtle trees, behind whom were red horses, speckled, and white: that he after-

\* 2 Ks. vi. 17.



wards saw four horses presented before him: that he saw a man with a measuring line in his hand: that he saw a golden candlestick and two olive trees: that he saw an ephah, or a sort of a measure, flying in the air, and a woman sitting in the midst of the ephah; and that he saw two other women with the wings of a stork, who lifted up the ephah between the earth and heaven; \* with many other things equally extraordinary. These he could not see with the eyes of his body: they were then things presented before the eyes of his spirit: thus they were appearances of things in the spiritual world: and that they all were representative of some spiritual subject, no one, surely, can doubt. Just the same was the case with John when he wrote the Revelation. We have already seen, that when he beheld the extraordinary things that were exhibited before him he was *in the spirit*, or in a state in which the senses of his spirit were opened: and that all the singular and wonderful appearances which he afterwards beheld were representations of spiritual subjects, and of the interior state of the things and persons to whom they related, no reflecting mind can doubt for a moment. Thus, for instance, when he was favored with a sight of the Lord as the Son of man: who can doubt that all the appearances which his divine person exhibited were exact correspondences of his divine attributes and perfections? for it is impossible to suppose that the person of the Lord, in itself, is such as is there described. Thus it is said of this glorious being, not only that “his head and his hairs were white like wool, as white as snow, and his eyes as a flame of fire, and his countenance as the sun shining in his strength;” but also that “his feet were like fine brass as though they burned in a furnace,—that he had in his right hand seven stars, and that out of his mouth went a sharp two edged sword.”† These are beautiful representative appearances,—his face like the sun, of his divine love in its interior, higher, and inmost nature, as perceived by angels; his feet like burning brass, of the same divine love in his Divine Natural Essence, whence he operates on men; the stars in his hand, of all the di-

\* Ch. i. 8; 18; ii. 1; iv. 2, 3; v. 6, 7; 9.

† Rev. i. 14, 15, 16.

vine principles of knowledge which he imparts to the church; and the sword from his mouth, of the power and operation of his Word or Divine Truth. And who can doubt, if the circumstances under which the Lord himself appears to those who enjoy such a privilege are thus representative of his attributes and the excellences of his nature, that the circumstances in which all the inhabitants of the spiritual world find themselves,—whether in heaven, in hell, or in the intermediate state, are representative of their state, quality, and nature, likewise, and that all the appearances which attend them entirely depend on those circumstances? And yet that the appearances which there exist are not mere illusions, having no reality whatsoever, is evident from the occurrence, that a little book was presented both to Ezekeiel and to John, and which was not only made manifest to their sight, but they were commanded to eat it; which they accordingly did, and both of them describe how it tasted. Ezekeiel affirms, “I did eat it, and it was in my mouth as honey for sweetness:”\* John says, “And I took the little book out of the angel’s hand, and ate it up; and it was in my mouth sweet as honey: and as soon as I had eaten it my belly was made bitter:”†—circumstances these which fully prove, that the spirit, in which John and Ezekeiel were, has its senses as well as the natural body: for that they could not eat a spiritual book with the organs of their natural body, is evident: the spiritual body only could eat a spiritual book or roll: and with their spiritual senses only could they distinguish its taste.

Evident, then, I apprehend, it is, that all things that exist in the spiritual world are appearances, which either are actually real, or appear as distinctly as if they were so to the senses of the inhabitants. If any one cannot believe that the things seen by the prophets had any proper reality, though they impressed their senses as such, we will not stop to dispute the point now: only I will assure him, that we believe all the appearances in the spiritual world described by Swedenborg to be of exactly the same kind: the one exist there as really as the other, and equally owe their origin to the spirit-

\* Ezek. iii, 3.

† Rev. x. 10.

ual things and states of which they are the outward manifestations. The only difference is, that the things seen by the prophets were appearances produced at the time by the Lord, to represent things and states belonging to the church and its members mostly at periods future to the time of the exhibition of the visions; whereas the appearances described by Swedenborg as ordinarily existing in heaven, hell, and the intermediate world, are those which constantly flow from the states of the angels, spirits, or infernals, about whom they are seen.

Plain enough, then, I apprehend, is the agreement of our author's assertions on this subject with the testimony of Scripture. And that it is equally agreeable to the suggestions of reason, is evident from the fact, that never did any one endeavor from his imagination to draw a picture, presenting anything in detail, of heaven or hell or their inhabitants, without accompanying it with such circumstances as he deemed expressive of the states of mind of those whom he wished to depict:\* the only difference being, that persons who have formed their guesses from their imagination, being ignorant of true correspondences or analogies between natural things and spiritual, have usually been very much mistaken as to the particulars of their figurative delineations. Many writers, also, have seen, that unless the objects that appear in heaven be analogous to those which are found on earth, our idea of heaven is an idea of a mere nothing. Thus the angel Raphael is made to say, in Milton's *Paradise Lost*,

———“What surmounts the reach  
Of human sense, I shall delineate so,  
By likening spiritual to corporeal forms,  
As may express them best: though *what if earth*  
*Be but the shadow of heaven, and things therein*  
*Each to other like, more than on earth is thought:”*

B. v. 571, &c.

In which striking lines he has exactly delineated the true state of the case. Be it asked then; Is it reasonable to condemn Swedenborg for affirming as a fact, what in Milton we admire as a highly probable conjecture? So

\* I am informed that a remarkable attempt of this kind is made in the popular opera of *Der Freyschutz*.

likewise, I am assured, even our present accuser has himself seen the necessity of finding some other objects wherewith to furnish heaven beside men in their revived material bodies; whence he once preached a sermon to prove, that there would be a resurrection of animals as well as of human beings; an idea which is favored also by the great Bishop Butler: and surely to put there horses and oxen, sheep and goats, dogs and cats,—to consider beasts as existing in the spiritual world in solid bodies of animal flesh and blood,—is immensely more extravagant than our idea, that such things do indeed exist there, but only in appearance. So, I suppose, every Methodist knows, that Mr Wesley furnishes his new earth, which he considers to be the habitation of the saints in glory, with all kinds of animals and other objects which exist in this earth, only in a much more perfect state. But surely, since all seem to be sensible, that, in some way or other, that world must contain such things, it is far more reasonable, with us, to conclude, that such things exist there as appearances, not possessing any conscious life of their own, existing only as outward figures of the states of the human inhabitants, and appearing or disappearing as those states change, than to imagine with our opponents that they exist there of themselves, real living creatures, enjoying for their own sakes the privilege of immortality. Reason teaches *us*, that the privilege of immortality only accompanies the faculty of rationality, and the capacity of being conjoined to THE IMMORTAL by the conscious reception of his life-giving energies.

If then our two general positions are seen to be true; if it be admitted that man after death, though no longer clothed with a material body, is a real and substantial man,—if good, endowed with the most exalted wisdom, and if wicked, though inexpressibly cunning, destitute of all true rationality and absolutely insane;—and if it be seen that the things which exist in heaven, hell, and the intermediate world, are appearances, exhibiting sensibly the inward states of those about whom they are seen; or if it be only known, what cannot be disputed, that this is the manner in which these subjects are represented in the writings of our Author and understood by us;—we are provided with satisfactory solutions of all those cir-



cumstances in his accounts of the nature of the spiritual world, which naturally at first appear strange, and which may easily be made to appear ridiculous. Refer them to their interior causes; and all pretext for ridicule disappears.\*

\* As Mr Beaumont has made a collection, under the title of *Sundry Extracts from the writings of Baron Swedenborg*, of six-and-twenty *Sundered Scraps*, which he thinks, when so presented, will appear ridiculous, we will here apply the principles above established to the explanation of the chief of the particulars which are stated; and will afterwards pass each of his scraps briefly under review, to shew how truly, when the circumstances are referred to their true causes, all pretext for ridicule disappears.

The most important of the circumstances pointed out for derision and which, indeed, is so truly important, in every point of view, that, if space would permit, it well deserves to be made the subject of a Section by itself, is

#### THE EXISTENCE OF THE MARRIAGE-UNION IN HEAVEN, AND OF AN OPPOSITE CONNEXION IN HELL.

Among the symptoms of corruption of manners and grossness of sentiment which are so general in the present day, there is none more conspicuous and glaring than the low ideas which we almost everywhere meet with of the nature and obligation of the conjugal covenant. Everything that is found in the Scriptures on this important subject, constantly adverts to the Marriage Union as a thing most pure, most holy, most heavenly; insomuch that, under the image of it, heaven itself is represented to us in the Word of God; yea, by this, as the only symbol worthy of the subject, is in the Sacred Records depicted the conjunction of God with the human race. On the other hand, a state of adultery is in the same Divine Word constantly spoken of, as justly representing, and accurately exhibiting to our apprehension, man's infidelity to his Maker, the state and nature of hell itself. Evidently then, in the Divine Mind, two more direct opposites do not exist, than the lawful and the unlawful connexion of the sexes: Yet who is to be found, among the general bulk of society, who in his own mind views the difference as so fundamental and irreconcilable? Who thinks that the true love of marriage is essentially holy, and the love of all connexions alien therefrom is essentially profane? Who regards the difference between them as intrinsically inherent in the things themselves, independently of all merely arbitrary appointment? It is true that few persons think that there is no difference whatever between the one and the other: the use of marriage in society is obvious to allow any but the most desperately profligate to maintain that the violation of its bonds is altogether a matter of indifference, or that libertine practices are free from criminality: but who supposes that the love of the one species of connexion and that of the other are two perfect opposites, and that the pleasures they afford to their respective votaries are essentially different, having in reality nothing whatever in common? How many are there, in fact, who look upon marriage as but a sort of legalized adultery, and upon adultery as differing in noth-

Now if the accounts of travellers in distant countries are read with delight: if even the minute occurrences which

ing but the want of the legal sanction from marriage! Hence, among the topics of revilement brought forward against the doctrines of the New Jerusalem, none is more frequently insisted on, none is more confided in, as capable of exposing them to utter derision and contempt, than this: that they affirm true marriage to be a permanent institution, true marriages to be indissoluble, even by the power of the grave; and that, in regard to all who enter the heavenly kingdom, should circumstances have prevented them from finding proper partners here, they will find such there, with whom their union continually becomes more perfect and more fraught with pure delight, through eternity. What is the law of Divine Order upon this subject, proclaimed at the beginning of creation, and confirmed most solemnly by the Lord Jesus Christ? "Have ye not read, that he which made them in the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh?" "Wherefore," says the Divine Confirmer of this original divine law, "they are no more twain, but one flesh." (Mat. xix. 4, 5, 6.) Because we believe this doubly authenticated statement of the Word of God; and because we believe that Jesus Christ uttered a law of eternal obligation, and spoke the plain truth, when he sealed the whole with the irreversible decree, "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder;" we are ridiculed and reviled as giving gross ideas of heaven: Whereas all the grossness is in the minds of our accusers, who cannot form a pure thought of so sacred an institution as that of marriage; who clearly betray, by their sneers respecting it, that in the thoughts of their hearts they think it essentially the same as any impure connexion; and who thence conclude, that to regard its chaste endearments to be perpetual, is to carnalize heaven. So the same parties think, it appears, that though adultery is sinful, it nevertheless is very delightful, and that to represent it as taking place in hell, is to render hell irresistibly inviting. Thus the Rev. Mr Beaumont affirms, that our doctrines make heaven not much better than this world, and hell not much worse: he would have us believe, that marriage is not only not a holy, but not a happy state, insomuch that to be eternally tied to a wife is enough to render heaven not over delightful; whilst to have the privilege of *keeping a harlot* (such is his phraseology, which includes, as we shall see in the sequel, a gross misrepresentation), is, as he represents it, so great a happiness, as to make hell itself a place of comfort; whence "our paupers might go to hell on speculation," (such is his decent language,) "with some prospect of advantage!" (P. 68.) So possessed is he with the notion, that to live with a harlot must be so delightful as amply to outweigh all other miseries, that he turns to it over and over again. The Candid and Reflecting, I am sure, will not envy our accuser his taste; they will not think that heaven should be turned from with disgust, because its inhabitants live in the pure love of the conjugal covenant, and that hell must be turned to with eagerness, because all who inhabit it are adulterers.

happened on the journey to the travellers themselves, and the familiar anecdotes by which they illustrate the

I trust we shall all, presently, see reason to conclude, that heaven is really a place and state of holiness, as well as of happiness, though all chaste conjugal partners are there; and that hell is a place and state of misery, as well as of wickedness, notwithstanding it is full of harlots and adulterers.

1. In the first place, then, how is it possible to represent the holiness of the pure and chaste conjugal connexion in a stronger light, than by describing, as the Scriptures do, the Lord Himself as one of the parties in such a union, and the church as the other? Thus we find the Lord saying to the church, "Fear not, for thou shalt not be ashamed, neither be thou confounded, for thou shalt not be put to shame: for thou shalt forget the shame of thy youth, and shalt not remember the reproach of thy widowhood any more. For thy Maker is thy Husband; the Lord of hosts is his name; and thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel: the God of the whole earth shall he be called." (Isa. liv. 4, 5.) So we find the penitent church saying in Hosea, "I will go and return to my first Husband; for then it was better with me than now." (ch. ii. 7): upon which the Lord says a little below, "And it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord, that thou shalt call me Ishi, and shall no more call me Baali." (ver. 16 :) Baali means, "My Lord, or Master," and Ishi means, "My Husband." The Lord says in Jeremiah respecting the church of the Israelites, "I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was a husband to them, saith the Lord" (ch. xxxi. 32). Many such passages might be added. And as Jehovah, in the Old Testament, thus constantly speaks of himself as the husband of his church, so is the Lord Jesus Christ, as being the manifested Jehovah, always mentioned in the New Testament in the same character, and he there claims the church as his bride and wife. "Can the children of the bridechamber mourn," says he (Mark ii. 19), "while the *bridegroom* is with them?" in answer to the question why his disciples did not fast. So in the parable of the wise and foolish virgins, it is said (Mat. xxv. 5, 6), that "while the *bridegroom* tarried they all slumbered and slept, and at midnight there was a cry made, Behold the *bridegroom* cometh, go ye forth to meet him:" where the *Bridegroom* is evidently the Lord Jesus Christ. But in how beautiful a manner is the marriage of the Lord with his church, in that glorious state of it called the New Jerusalem, described in the Revelation! "I John, saw the holy city, New Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a *bride* adorned for her *husband*.—And there came unto me one of the seven angels which had the seven vials full of the seven last plagues, and talked with me saying, Come hither, I will shew thee the *bride*, the *Lamb's wife*." (ch. xxi. 2, 9.) And how truly sublime is the previous announcement of these nuptials! "A voice came out of the throne, saying, Praise our God, all ye his servants, and ye that fear him, both small and great. And I heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of migh-

manners of the people and the character of the place, are found to possess great interest, though we never

ty thunderings, saying, Allelujah, for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth. Let us be glad, and rejoice, and give honour to him, for the marriage of the Lamb is come and his wife hath made herself ready.—And he saith unto me, Write : *Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage-supper of the Lamb.* And he saith unto me, These are the true sayings of God.” (ch. xix. 5, 6, 7, 9.) Are not these most magnificent, most beautiful, and most affecting representations, of the union of the Lord with his church, and of the divine love from which he desires such a union? Is it not also certain, that the union of the Lord with his church, is, next to the union of the Essential Divinity or Father with the Divine Humanity or Son, the most holy subject which is offered to the contemplation of man? Must not then that which is constantly taken to present it to our apprehension,—the marriage covenant,—be holy likewise? And, indeed, what could so properly represent this holy union of the Lord with his church, as a union, of an inferior nature indeed, but which originates in, and flows down from, the higher union, and thus, as an effect from its cause, is the proper image for exhibiting it to view?

But not only does the Lord, both before the incarnation and since, deign to describe himself as the Bridegroom and Husband of his church, and his church, as his bride and wife, but he presents heaven itself to us under the idea of a marriage, and describes admission into heaven as admission to a marriage. This is done in the last extract from the Revelation, and in several of the Lord's discourses. “The kingdom of heaven, saith he, is like unto a certain king which made a marriage for his son, and sent forth his servants to call them that were bidden to the wedding; and they would not come.” (Mat. xxii. 2, 3.) So likewise the wise virgins, being ready when the bridegroom came, “went in with him to the marriage;” which evidently means, were admitted into heaven. Here again we see the high honor done on every occasion by the Lord to the conjugal covenant. His first miracle (John ii. 2, &c,) was wrought when he was present at a marriage as a guest; and he borrows the image of a marriage as the only one worthy to exhibit to his disciples the nature of his kingdom,—of heaven itself. Do I say he borrows the image of a marriage to describe his kingdom? What if it be true that his kingdom is not only figuratively, but positively and essentially, a marriage, and that what is called marriage among us is only a copy, a derivation from that marriage which is heaven itself?

This will be seen to be the fact, by all who, rising above merely carnal ideas of the subject, consider the passages we have recited from the Word of God, and the numerous other testimonies pointing to the same truth with which the Word of God abounds, and look at the cause in which such statements are grounded.

For what can we imagine is the reason why the Lord Himself, even the Eternal Jehovah, before his incarnation as well as after it, thus delights to describe himself as the Husband and the church as his wife? What can be the reason that he constantly exhibits his king-



expect to visit those countries ourselves; what delight ought to attend the perusal of an authentic account of

dom to us under the idea of a marriage? What can it be, but because the first and original marriage exists in his own essence; wherefore images of that marriage are thence derived through all the lower links of the great chain of existence, down to the last boundaries of created nature? Take an image of it as presented by the sun of this world, which is often referred to in the Scriptures as an image of the Lord, the sun of righteousness. Do we not well know that there must be two distinct principles which constitute the nature of that sun, because we evidently see and feel that two distinct things proceed from it, and testify their existence by their effects? Do there not proceed from the sun both heat and light? And do we not find that these may exist either separately (or, at least, in very unequal proportions) or together? In the season of winter the light is as bright, or nearly so, as in the middle of summer; yet because it is not united with heat, the earth is bound up with frost, and all the objects of the vegetable kingdom are in a state of torpidity and comparative death: but when spring comes on, and the light is united with heat, all things bloom and bud, and nature celebrates the symbolic marriage by rejoicing through all her domains. Now light and heat existing in their first principles in, and thence proceeding from, the sun of nature, are evident symbols of love or goodness, and wisdom or truth existing in their first principles in, and thence proceeding from, the Lord Himself, the eternal source of all things. Fire or heat is the plain symbol of love; and every one sees that light is the plain symbol of truth; whence nothing is more common than to speak of *warmth of affection* and of the *light of truth*. The apostle assures us in plain terms (1 John iv. 8) that God is love; and Jesus Christ declares (John viii. 12) that He is "the Light." Doubtless then these two principles exist in their source in God in the most perfect union: they unitedly constitute his essential nature; and both in him being infinite, their union must be infinitely perfect; there can be no disproportion between them; no preponderance of the one over the other. All that Infinite Love desires, Infinite Wisdom can direct and bring into effect; and all that Infinite Wisdom points to as desirable, Infinite Love can inspire and energize. Here then is marriage, in its first source. The union of love and wisdom in God is the truly divine marriage, and is essential to the very nature of Deity; and from this divine, this thrice holy source, proceeds all that can justly be esteemed marriage in lower spheres, and in proportion as this is in them, all inferior unions, each in its degree, also are holy. Hence likewise there is something analogous to the male and female character even in inanimate things. Hence common perception teaches men to consider even the sun and moon as

"Communicating male and female light,"

and to deduce thence the general, sublime, and true assertion,

"Which two great sexes animate the world."

From this marriage, then, of goodness or love and truth or wisdom

that eternal country to which we are all hastening, and with what interest should we hang over a favored trav-

in the Deity himself, next flows the heavenly marriage between the Lord and his church; which is effected when the church also receives, from the Lord, love and wisdom in union. The church has nothing belonging to her as a church, but what she receives from the Lord; nevertheless, she first exists as an unbetrothed virgin, next as a bride, and finally as a wife. For although love and wisdom, as they exist in union in the Lord, proceed also in union from him, they are not at once received in union by man. Man, being in evil, must first be instructed in divine truths, and thus be led in the path of repentance and reformation, before he can possibly be principled in that pure goodness to which all genuine truth points, and with which it desires to be conjoined. While then the church is in the affection of truth, but has not yet advanced to maturity in the appropriation of its practical tendency, she is what the Scripture calls a virgin: when she is matured by the application of her truths to life, and is in the ardent desire to be all that truth has opened to her conceptions, and thus to be united with the Lord, the Author both of her truth and her love, she is what the Scripture calls a bride: and when, accordingly, she receives the Lord as to the love or goodness of which he is the author, in the same degree that she receives the knowledge of his truth; when, in the language of the divine epithalamium in Ps. xlv. she has completely *forsaken her own people and her father's house*, or rejected all the false and evil principles which adhere to her by nature; then it is that her marriage is come, and that the Lord calls himself her husband and owns her as his wife.

It is in this marriage then of goodness and truth, which is the same thing as the marriage of the Lord with the church, that heaven essentially consists. None can be in heaven, but those with whom goodness and truth, thus perfectly united, form the life of their minds. With those who are there, love or goodness is the vital heat, truth or wisdom is a light that emanates from it, and forms as it were a clothing around it. Hence it is said of Jehovah himself (Ps. civ. 2,) that he *covereth himself with light as with a garment*. To wear a *wedding garment* then, according to the Scripture phrase, is to be principled in genuine truth originating in genuine goodness; or, what is the same thing, to be principled in true faith grounded in real charity: but not to have on a wedding garment, is to be in the mere profession of faith without any charity, in which case the faith also is not genuine, and cannot be endured in heaven, even should a hypocrite now and then, as appears from the case of the man without a wedding garment in the parable, to be not impossible, insinuate himself into that kingdom.

This view of the nature of the heavenly marriage must, it may be presumed, recommend itself to every one. No one can suppose that any man can be entertained in heaven who is not principled in both the great heavenly graces of faith and charity; and faith is truth really seen and believed, and charity is goodness really felt and loved: Each is essential to the perfection of the other, and without both, neither is genuine. How justly then is their union called

eller's detail of the familiar incidents which are there constantly occurring, and in which we must, ere long be

a marriage! And how evident it is, that in such a marriage, heaven must essentially consist,—that this lies at the source of all its perfections and beatitudes!

But it is certain that man could not be receptive either of goodness or truth, either of charity or faith, from the Lord, were he not created with faculties adapted for their entertainment. Accordingly, he has two great faculties in his mental constitution, of which all his mental powers are specific modifications, which faculties are commonly denominated the will and the understanding; the will being the seat of all man's desires and affections, and the understanding the seat of all his thoughts and ideas. The understanding can comprehend the truths of religion even while man is in an unregenerate state,—otherwise he could never become regenerate at all; yet such truths are never agreeable to it while the will is in evil. But the will cannot love genuine goodness, except by regeneration; although there may be amiable natural affections, such as those of good nature, in the will, by birth. The heavenly marriage then consists in the reception of goodness in the will as well as of truth in the understanding, and in the uniting into one of the will and understanding in the acknowledgment, love, and service of the Lord: and it is by virtue of such marriage that the mind becomes replenished with heavenly graces through all its powers. New affections of goodness, and new perceptions of truth, then spring up in it every day; which are a spiritual offspring, flowing from the union of goodness and truth in the inmost of the mind. And the whole is the result of the divine operation of the Lord, continually flowing into, and rendering fruitful, the goodness and truth in union which man has received from him: thus the whole of the spiritual births produced in the human mind are derived from the marriage of the Lord and the church; for which reason, also, the church is sometimes described in the Word as a mother; and all know that the Lord is the universal Father.

This then is the case with every one who becomes regenerate, whether man or woman. In all, the heavenly marriage takes place; and each, by virtue of it, becomes a member of the bride the Lamb's wife. I say, *a member* of the heavenly bride and wife, not *a* bride and wife, to guard against enthusiastic fancies; into which some, in various denominations, more particularly of the female sex, have fallen, in consequence of knowing from the Word that the Lord is called the Husband of the church, without having that correct apprehension of the subject which the doctrines of our church impart: for it is only to the church universal considered as one body, that, in a strict sense, the Lord stands in the character of a Husband.

But in order that this heavenly marriage might exist in greater fullness, and thus that his divine love and wisdom with their accompanying beatitudes might be more fully received in heaven and in the church, the Lord has also been pleased so to form the human species, by creation, that two minds might likewise be capable of a similar intimate union, and thus become a real one, notwithstanding their abiding in two persons. The only means of effecting this, was,

called to take our share! That a special traveller should be empowered to communicate such information, by no

so to form the human race, as that in some minds affection might most decidedly predominate, and in others intellect: and who can deny that this constitutes the first distinction of the male and female character? The difference between the male and female exists quite as decidedly in their minds as in their outward forms; so that if it were possible to abolish all difference in the shape of their persons, this would by no means be sufficient to abolish all real distinction of sex; the sex is in the mind also, and can never be extirpated thence. On every subject whatsoever, one part of the species will ever think and feel as men and the other as women. The minds, it is true, both of men and women, are constituted both of will and intellect, affection and intelligence: but who does not see that the man takes his distinguishing character from the predominating strength of his intellect, and woman hers from the predominating strength of her affections? Great disputes have been agitated on the question, Whether there is an inferiority on the part of females compared with men: but as, unfortunately, both parties have looked on intellect as the distinguishing faculty of the human race, and have overlooked, as of minor importance, the no less essential and valuable attributes of will and reflection; men, in asserting their preeminence, have relied on the former alone, and female writers, with some auxiliary males, in denying the superiority, have allowed the principle for which it is claimed to be the right criterion of it; and hence, instead of making good their claim, as they might have done, had they only asserted a general equality, have failed, through claiming an equality in the same principle of intellect. Intellect is not a more excellent attribute than affection, and in affection, undoubtedly, the superiority is all on the side of the female sex. And the sexes were thus endowed with equal but distinct excellences, that they might not engage in rivalry, but combine in union: that female affection might both soften and exalt the intellect of the male, and that masculine intellect might guide and protect female affection. Affection without intellect is blind; intellect without affection is dead: when united, intellect is quickened with life, affection rejoices in light. The female mind, however, is by no means destitute of intellect, nor the male destitute of affection; but who can look at both, and not allow that the two principles exist in each in unequal proportions, so that one, only, forms the predominating characteristic of each? Hence it is that when a male and female mind really enter into interior union, which never can take place but where both are in the heavenly marriage of goodness and truth, the perfection of each is immensely exalted, and with it the happiness; each is a more perfect angel than either could be separately; and the union of minds becomes so perfect, that before the Lord, by whom minds only are looked at, they become as one.

This then is that marriage which we affirm to be perpetual, and to exist in heaven: and is it not evidently founded in the very first principles of things, in the very first laws of nature?—understanding by the laws of nature those which determine the conditions of things, in the spiritual as well as in the material worlds, throughout



means exceeds the bounds of rational credibility, nor even of probability. The possibility of it is abundantly

the universe of creation. The marriage of goodness and truth which constitutes heaven is the immediate source of it: itself is a union of minds in which that prior marriage exists; and the outward union is only a true marriage where there is the inner union also: without which, notwithstanding its having the sanction of the laws, it is an impure connexion, tending more or less to the nature of adultery.

It is first of all then of the marriage of goodness and truth that the Lord speaks in the text cited above, when he says that he which made them in the beginning made them male and female. By male and female, in a purely spiritual sense, are meant the principles of intellect and will as formed for the reception of truth and goodness respectively; the eternal law of order and of God respecting which is, that they should be united, and never be separated by the self-derived intelligence of man; which is what He means when He says, "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." Secondly, these words declare the perpetuity of such union of male and female minds as originates in the marriage of goodness and truth. This is in fact the plain literal sense of the words: and of this marriage also the Divine Speaker authoritatively pronounces, "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder:"—as is done by those who deny the intrinsically holy nature of such marriage, and affirm that it must be put asunder for ever by death. If it was not unworthy of the Paradise in which man was placed at creation, how should it be unworthy, when exalted to the same degree of purity as creation appointed for it, of the Paradise to which man is to be restored by redemption? To accuse then a writer of impurity, because he restores the chaste love of marriage to the dignified station assigned it by the Creator, and confirmed by the Redeemer; vindicating its heavenly origin, and shewing it to possess that perpetuity which every thing heavenly must inherently carry with it; is a work only worthy of those whom the celebrated Milton denounces as hypocrites;

"Whatever hypocrites austerely talk  
Of purity, and place, and innocence,  
Defaming as impure what God declares  
Pure".— P. L. iv. 744, &c.

So in his beautiful apostrophe to wedded love, he says,

"Far be it I should write thee sin, or blame,  
Or think thee unbecoming holiest place."\*  
Ib. 758, &c.

What Scripture and reason thus dictate, follows, also, from the first of the two general truths we have established in the text above. If man is a real man after death; and if, as we have now seen, the origin of the distinction of sex is in the spirit; it necessarily follows,

---

\* It may with certainty be affirmed, that the more pure and heavenly any mind has been, the more has it been inclined to ascribe purity and perpetuity to this heavenly union. Thus the

evinced by the narratives of Scripture; and the facility of it is demonstrated by the views of man's constitution,

that human beings in the eternal world are male and female still; and if so, that there are unions between them. It equally results from our second general truth. For if all the circumstances in which the angels are placed are representative of the state of their minds; and if their minds are in the heavenly marriage of goodness and truth; it follows that they must be united by pairs in a marriage expressive of that within. Besides, what gloom and discomfort does the other supposition, when accurately looked at, introduce into our idea of heaven! Who that has been tenderly and virtuously attached to a female, and has walked with her in the path to heaven, would

---

heavenly minded Mrs Fletcher, in continuing her remarks on the continuance of her union with her deceased husband, from which an extract is made in the text above (p. 171), expresses herself thus: "As spiritual union arises from a communication of the love which flows from the heart of Christ, I cannot but believe a nearer approach to its centre, and a fuller measure of that divine principle, must increase, and not diminish, the union between kindred souls; and that their change will consist, not in the loss, but in the improvement, of all good."—"Will not [it is asked] all particular unions cease? and is it not the design of God that death should divide? To answer this objection I must premise, that *what is of God shall stand*. I plead only for that union which has God for its source; and I think it will not be hard to prove that *what God hath joined together, death cannot put asunder*. Division comes not from God, but from the devil. God, both in his nature and works, is perfect unity; and his original design for our first parents was not sorrow, consequently, not separation.—If we suppose their friendship was not to have been immortal, we must suppose pain to be in paradise: for Adam could not without pain inform Eve of such an awful secret, that, when they had praised God together for a certain time, they must eternally forget each other.—Or suppose he had said, Though we shall have a bare remembrance of each transaction, nevertheless that *close union*, that endearing *oneness of soul*, of which the *love of God* was the foundation,—that very union hereafter the *love of God* is to dissolve! This would indeed have been in itself exceeding bitter, and therefore never was the original design of love. It was sin that brought in separation. It was owing to the hardness of our hearts; for in the beginning it was not so; *for God created one man and one woman*."—She continues in the same strain for two or three pages further, in which she introduces this sentence of Swedenborg's, "Similitude joins, but dissimilitude separates." (Pp. 203, 204.) This was written soon after her husband's death. Two years afterwards she writes, "I was led to reflect on my union with my dear husband.—The question arose, What part of our union can heaven dissolve? It will take away all that was painful; such as our fears for each other's safety, our separations, &c. But what of the pleasant part can heaven dissolve? I answered from the bottom of my heart, Nothing, Lord, nothing! Clear as light it appear-

and of the laws of the spiritual world, discovered in the writings of Swedenborg. Indeed, many divines and

not feel it a grievous blow to his happiness, should he find her, there, totally unlike the being he knew here? Could there even be any perfect social happiness in a society consisting of all males, or all neuters? Independently of its use in the continuance of the species, is not the division into sexes a most beneficent arrangement, immensely adding to the comforts, and harmonizing the intercourses of the human race? Is it not then reasonable to conclude, that this use of it will be perpetuated, where the former ceases? And is it not the essence of reason to conclude, that a union in which, in its genuine state, is centered all that is heavenly on earth,—including a love which prefers another's welfare to its own, and a joy which nothing but such a love can inspire,—must, when exalted to its highest perfection, be among the highest beatitudes of heaven itself?\*

ed to me, that heaven could not dissolve anything that agreed with its own nature. Let two drops of water, two flames of fire, or any two quantities of the same element be put together; they would not destroy each other, but would be increased. So what came down from God would, when returned to its source, live for ever, and be corroborated but not lessened. I am quite at a loss," she adds, "for words to describe the feelings of that hour; but it fixed in my soul an assurance of our eternal union." (Pp. 236, 237.) And though she outlived her husband thirty years, her journal, till near the end, contains frequent repetitions of her convictions of the continuance of their union, and her sense of it. (See Pp. 255, 275, 364, 394.)—Similar to the feelings of Mrs F. in regard to the perpetuity of her union with her departed husband, were those of the pious Newton in regard to his with his departed wife. In a poem on the subject, beautiful more for sentiment than expression, he says,

“ Shall one so favored e'er repine  
Or one so vile complain?  
No! Let me praise! She long was mine,  
And shall be mine again.  
If death could break our union past,  
Frail, though endeared, the tie:  
The stronger band of love shall last,  
When death itself shall die.”

And the inspirations of the Muse, have dictated the same truth, even where the ordinary habits of the mind might be supposed to have closed it to a perception so heavenly: witness the following stanza of Byron's:

“ There are two souls whose equal flow  
In gentle streams so calmly run,  
That when they part—they part!—ah no!  
They cannot part—those souls are one.”

\* It is necessary here to observe, that our accusers, because they have purely Sadducean notions of marriage to accompany their half

philosophers have seen that man is by creation a subject of both worlds, the spiritual and the natural. If by his

On the whole : If the plain testimony of Scripture, the most obvious deductions of Reason, and the most decided convictions of the intelligent and pious, be sufficient to determine this question, no

Sadducean notions of the resurrection,—whence, like the Sadducees in the gospel, they “do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God,” think they find a contradiction to these sentiments in the Lord’s answer to the Sadducees, denying the existence of *their sort of marriages* in heaven. The Sadducees asked whose wife a woman that had had seven husbands should be in the resurrection. To whom Jesus answered, “Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.” (Mat. xxii. 29, 30.) In the term “resurrection,” it is to be observed, is not included “the resurrection of damnation,” but simply, “the resurrection of life,” that is, the heavenly state; hence it is said that they are “as the angels of God in heaven:” and to the truth of the answer, thus limited, most unquestionably, no exception can be made. It is true that there are no such merely carnal connexions as the Sadducees spoke of, which it is a degradation of the name to call marriages, in heaven at all: there can be no such thing there as the transferring of a woman from one man to another, nor any such connexion as such transfer implies: but it does not hence follow that there are in heaven no marriages which have for their essence that marriage of goodness and truth, which is the essence of heaven itself. It is also true, that the marriage of goodness and truth, if not commenced on earth, cannot be originated after death. It is in this world that charity must be joined with faith, and both with the Lord: otherwise this never can be done hereafter. But though this truth might yield a sufficient solution of the difficulty, it does not appear to be to the marriage of goodness and truth, nor to any unions originating therein, that the passage specifically relates. It appears evident from the phraseology used in this answer to the Sadducees, compared with that of the former answer to the Pharisees, that the marriage here spoken of is the opposite of the other,—the marriage of evil and falsehood, and such outward marriages as have this for their essence, and not the marriage of goodness and truth, and such outward marriages as draw their essence thence. For in the answer to the Pharisees, the Lord is mentioned as the author of the union,—“What God hath joined together;” but in this to the Sadducees the marriages spoken of are those which proceed from the mere self will of man, without being in any way referred to God at all,—“they neither marry,”—as men of their own motion,—“nor are given in marriage,”—as women by their relatives; which form of expression is admirably expressive of what originates from man and not from God, as do all unions of evil and error, and all marriages in which evil and error are inwardly regarded. Accordingly, in the only other passage in which the same phrase occurs, this is obviously its meaning: “As in the days that were before the flood, they were eating and drinking, *marrying and giving in mar-*



spirit he belongs to the spiritual world, and he has a spirit within him while he lives in the body; it cannot

question, it appears, can be more conclusively decided. The Lord himself is a Husband, and heaven is a marriage. Of such marriages as originate in the marriage of goodness and truth, the Truth It-

---

*riage*, until the day that Noe entered the ark, and knew not till the flood came and took them all away." (Mat. xxiv. 38, 39.) Evidently, in the wicked persons who perished by the flood, no spiritual marriage but that of evil and falsehood could be formed; and by them no natural marriages but such as are outward forms of the same could be contracted; and if it is reasonable to suppose that the same phrase bears the same sense when it occurs elsewhere under similar circumstances, there can be no doubt that this is the sense which marrying and giving in marriage bears in the case before us. Thus understood, the answer to the Sadducees and that to the Pharisees are in strict agreement; otherwise they are in direct opposition. If we suppose the true meaning of the answer to the Sadducees to be, that in heaven there are no marriages whatsoever, the answer to the Pharisees is flatly contradicted; for that answer admits of no explanation which will reconcile it with this notion. The statement there made is of the most uncompromising kind. The union of the sexes is declared to be a provision of the Divine Economy from the beginning, to be effected under the Divine Auspices, and, when so effected, to partake of the Divine Perpetuity; whilst all separation is declared to originate from man himself; he is forbidden to cause it, and its permission in any case is ascribed to the hardness of his heart. "He which made them at the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: *and they twain shall be one flesh.* WHEREFORE, THEY ARE NO MORE TWIN BUT ONE FLESH. WHAT THEREFORE GOD HATH JOINED TOGETHER, LET NOT MAN PUT ASUNDER.—Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so." When it is here said, "*Wherefore, they are no more twain, but one flesh,*" have we not the most explicit assurance, that a pair so united can never be sundered *any more*? What else can be the purport of the emphatic words "*no more?*" And when it is added, "*What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder,*" are we not assured, as Mrs Fletcher explains it, that "*what is of God shall stand?*" To suppose that death can divide what God has united, is, also, not only to make death stronger than Omnipotence, but it is also to contradict the text, "O death, where is thy sting?" for, as Mrs Fletcher again observes, in a passage not before quoted, "If death can eternally separate kindred spirits, he hath eternally a sting." (p. 205.) It is impossible then to suppose that the divine declaration is confined to unions in this life: for this would not only be to exalt the power of death above that of God, but to make empty words of the statement, "They are *no more twain.*" And doubtless, if the order of Creation, and the design of the Creator, are, that the human race should be united indissolubly in pairs, the circumstance of such a union not

be difficult for him who is the Author of both to open the senses of his spirit even while he lives in the body;

self—God incarnate—declares, that they shall never be put asunder; and all who by living near to heaven, or by the occasional illapses of a heaven-descended intelligence, have been qualified to judge of the subject correctly have here set to their seal, that God is true.

---

having commenced in this life cannot prevent its accomplishment in the other. Thus then the meaning of this answer to the Pharisees is most explicit, and it admits of no interpretation which will reconcile it to the answer to the Sadducees, if that be supposed to affirm that in the other life there are no marriages whatsoever; whereas if we understand the answer to the Sadducees to mean, what, we have seen, the same phraseology certainly does mean elsewhere,—that in heaven there are no marriages originating in the union of evil and falsehood,—all appearance of contradiction disappears; and the declaration, that “in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven;” harmonizes most beautifully with the other declaration, that they who are in the marriage which originates in the union of goodness and truth, as are all “the angels in heaven,” “are no more twain, but one flesh,” and that “what God hath joined together,” it is not for man to “put asunder.”

It is probable indeed that the Sadducees, like many who have come after them, understand the Lord to affirm that in heaven there are no marriages whatsoever: but it was quite customary with the Lord to give such answers to those who conversed with him as were understood by them in a contrary sense to the true one, without his correcting their misapprehensions; according to his own statement, that he spoke “to those who were without in parables” or dark sayings, “that hearing they might hear and not understand.” Thus we read (John ii. 18 to 21,) “The Jews said unto him, What sign shewest thou unto us, seeing thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building; and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But,” adds the evangelist, “he spake of the temple of his body.” He did not however tell them so, but left them to their own notions. Just so in his answer to the Sadducees. He answered their questions in a sense strictly true. He told them that there were no marriages such as alone they thought of in heaven,—such as are of the natural man alone, and not of the spiritual man, and which thus have their true origin in the man of evil and error: and he left them to understand his words also in a sense not true, and to suppose that in heaven there are no marriages whatever. The reason of this conduct, in this instance, is obvious. It is impossible to impart to such characters as the Sadducees pure and elevated ideas on the subject of marriage. Explain it as you will, they will still attach to it their gross and merely carnal conceptions. It is better then for such persons to think that in heaven there are no marriages at all, than to think there are any such connexions there as they call by the name; for this would indeed be to carnalize heaven. Hence Divine Truth

he must then be at once perceptibly amid the objects of the spiritual world, in the same manner as he will be

2. We are now to pass to a less pleasing subject. If it be certain that such marriages as originate in the heavenly marriage of goodness and truth exist in heaven, and this by reason that man after death is still a man, and the distinction of sex exists in the spirit; and that the circumstances in which spirits and angels are placed are all such as correspond to, and are expressive of, their internal state; it will follow also, that such marriages as the Sadducees thought of, which are connexions of the sexes originating in the infernal marriage of evil and falsehood, and which the Lord declares do not exist in heaven, exist in hell. According to Swedenborg, the state of every one's mind in regard to the connexion of the sexes always agrees exactly with the state of his mind in regard to his reception of the graces constituent of the church: hence, all in whom the church really is, think chastely of marriage, and regard adultery with aversion and even horror; whereas all who are opposed to the principles of the church, think unchastely of marriage, and regard adultery with pleasure, even though, by external considerations, they may be restrained from practising it: thus such characters are truly adulterers, even when they remain within the forms of marriage. As then man's state in regard to the connexion of the sexes always keeps pace with his state in regard to the principles of the church, all who are in heaven are in the love of marriage, and all who are in hell are in the love of adultery; the former are chaste conjugal partners, the latter are foul adulterers and harlots. But it would be a great error hence to conclude, that in hell is permitted, as Mr B. expresses it, and to which he repeatedly turns, as a circumstance so inviting, "the indulgence of keeping a harlot," in the manner that the dissolute practice it on earth. The dissolute keep harlots on earth, because they are not bound by the same duties to them as to a wife; because they do not consider themselves under, to them, any obligation of fidelity, and can dismiss or change them at pleasure; thus, because, as is so often boasted, they retain their liberty, and are not under an irksome restraint, as such characters esteem the tie of marriage. But in hell such license is not permitted. A wicked man, when become a spirit, is indeed allowed to associate himself with one of the opposite sex; and all the females there are by Swedenborg called harlots, because they are all such in heart, and because it would be a prostitution of the title to apply to such the sacred name of wife; but, as is even stated in a passage cited by Mr B. to support his calumnies, "he is forbid, on pain of

---

in mercy speaks to such characters in proverbs: hence the Sadducees were left to believe, as better for them, that in heaven there are no marriages at all: and hence Divine Providence so overrules men's apprehensions of heavenly things, as is best for their own states, that they who are still incapable of forming any but carnal conceptions of the divine institution of marriage, will never be persuaded, even by the clear light in which the subject is placed in the writings of Swedenborg, that it exists in heaven.

after death; and accordingly, we have seen, it was thus that views of the spiritual world have been vouchsafed

punishment, to connect himself with more than one." Thus those whom Swedenborg calls harlots, Mr B. would call "their lawful wives:" (See *Anti-S.* p. 68 :) and then, perhaps, the delightful fascination, which he represents as inseparably connected with the name of *harlot*, would be gone. As to the *delightfulness* of such cohabitation, it may be in some measure appreciated from what is experienced by those who are tied to an utterly abandoned companion here; and when this is the character of both, it is well known that such scenes of horror even here arise, as every one acknowledges to exhibit on earth an image of hell. What then must be the case in hell itself, where as Swedenborg affirms, they not only soon regard each other with the utmost coldness and disgust, "but they interiorly burn with deadly hatred against each other, which is so great as to admit of no description!" (H. H. n. 377.)

If then the distinction of sex is rooted in the spirit, it is certain that there must be connexions between the sexes in hell as well as in heaven: but those in hell, it is evident, must be of a diametrically opposite character to those in heaven. Where there is the infernal marriage of evil and falsehood in the mind, as is the case with all in hell, the connexions between the sexes must derive their essence from that origin; and as all evil is inseparably conjoined, in the other life, with punishment and misery, such infernal marriages, *alias* adulteries, can be productive of no sensations which have not misery in their centre. Whether these can yet be so delightful as to outweigh all the other miseries, with which, as we have seen above, the inhabitants of hell are pursued, and to make hell a place to which "our paupers may go on speculation," let the reader judge.

The circumstances that we will next vindicate from aspersion, may be stated in the following proposition. *That those who die as infants or children all go to heaven; but that at first they appear as children still, and are educated by the ministry of angels till they become adult angels themselves; and that in the mean time they are instructed by such representations of heavenly things as are suited to their tender capacities, and are allowed such recreations as are congenial to their state.* Proposed in these terms, what is there here to which the rational faculty does not immediately assent? Yet this it precisely what Swedenborg has advanced, however Mr B. may hold up his statements to ridicule.

When a man dies at an adult age and in a state of regeneration, we may suppose that he is qualified presently to appear in heaven as an angel: but who can imagine that the case is the same with the dying infant? The infant is indeed in a state of innocence; it has never committed or appropriated anything evil, and thus is secure from hell; but its innocence is the innocence of ignorance, not as yet that of wisdom: it as yet is incapable of appropriating good; consequently it is not as yet prepared to take its place as an angel. An angel is a form of love and wisdom derived from the Lord; an infant has capacities for becoming such a form: but it is not made such a one by mere death. As an infant is born with only the rudiments of a perfect human body, so also is it born, we



to prophets and others. Is it at all surprising then, that such an opening of the spiritual sight should take place

know full well, with only the rudiments of a perfect human mind, or which amounts to the same thing, of a perfect human spirit, since it is the spirit which is the seat of the mind: and the one is to be successively developed and perfected, as well as the other. To suppose then that, if it passes in this state into the eternal world, the mind and spirit will instantly expand into the fulness of the standard of an angel, is just as reasonable as to imagine, that a new born child may expand in an instant into the stature of a man. There surely then cannot be a shadow of doubt, that when an infant enters the spiritual world by death, it will appear there in a form exactly answering to the infantile state of its mind: consequently, it must appear there, and be, an infant still. As the faculties of its mind are developed, and it advances in wisdom, it will advance also to the form and appearance of the adult angel. It is reasonable to imagine, as Swedenborg assures us, that in that world of higher perfection its advancement will be far more rapid than is possible here: yet even there the rudiments of wisdom must first be inseminated, and afterwards be cultivated and enlarged, before the mature angelic state can be attained. Now under what auspices is this to be effected? Doubtless, under those of the Lord, who is the only Parent known in heaven, and whose especial care and providence, according to the dictates of reason and the statements of Swedenborg, watch over the welfare of helpless and innocent children. But is it to be supposed that he will lead them to maturity there, any more than he does here, without deigning to associate any of their fellow creatures in the important task? Scripture informs us that, even while here, infants are under the guardianship of angels exercised under the particular providence of the Lord: "Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven" (Mat. xviii. 10).—Is it then to be supposed, that, by passing from this world into the other, they not only lose their human parents but their angelic guardians too; that to them the eternal world is an immense desert, where no protectors are near,—where, though helpless infants still, they are friendless and alone? Will no kind angel minister to them in the tender manner which their state requires? Is it the part either of the rational mind or of the feeling heart to ridicule such ministrations, by applying to them, as Mr B. does, the contemptuous title of "*nursing in heaven?*" Is there any among the natural affections so exalted as that of the love of children? Is anything more affecting to be seen on earth, than the care of a fond mother for her offspring, and the delight with which she ministers to their helplessness? Is not the implantation of parental love in the human breast one of the most striking products of the divine love in the Great Parent of all, and one that most nearly imitates its original? Is it not then to be concluded, that this affection, which is heavenly even on earth, will not be extinguished, but exalted, on transplantation into heaven itself, and that they who have here been eminently influenced by a love to children

in an extraordinary manner, with one individual, at the era of the Lord's second coming? Most people believe, that in the primeval ages of the world man lived in perpetual society with angels, and that it was not till he had far descended in degeneracy that it came to be the character of "angel visits" to be "few and far between:" and most people believe also, that in the latter ages of the world such communications will be restored, and angels will again be closely associated with men: is it then at all unreasonable to expect, that, as preparatory to such a state, should it be the purpose of Providence to produce it, or in lieu of it, should that be without the provisions of the Divine Economy, some distinct, accurate, precise, and even familiar knowledge, respecting the eternal world, its appearances, its inhabitants, and its laws, should be communicated, through the instrumentality of one commissioned herald, to beings who belong to it, in part, even now, and are soon to belong to it altogether? When man's former state, and his still unaltered nature as a subject of both worlds, are reflected on, the wonder surely is, that the world of which his better part is a native and a denizen should ever have become so shut out from him, and all particular know-

will be animated by a corresponding but spiritual affection for them there, and will be impelled by it to undertake, with the utmost delight, the charge of the infant spirits which are continually passing thither? If Mr B. will put this inquiry to the ladies of his acquaintance, the hearts of all of them, I am sure, will dictate an affirmative answer. Common perception appears to inform every reflecting mind, that such must be the fact;—that the task of receiving the children who go thither, and nurturing their innocent but unformed minds in the accomplishments of heavenly wisdom, must be one of the most delightful, and one of the most general, of the employments of angels. Let then Mr B. be careful how he extinguishes in himself or others the principle that would take delight in such offices, and how he too proudly disdains, what no sneers can degrade, the sweetest exercises of charity. Infants, when first landed on the eternal shore, must need such exercises from some quarter; and they by whose instrumentality the Lord administers them, doubtless regard it as a high privilege, and feel in it the most delicious enjoyment. Insensibility, we may be assured, is not an inmate of angelic breasts; and heaven is not peopled with a starched and stiffened race, who deem it beneath their high vocation to descend to the softest and most affecting duties of the meekest tenderness and love. "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God."

ledge respecting it so utterly lost,—not that they should again be restored: and when could their restoration be more appropriately in place, than among the blessings attendant on the second coming of the Lord, and consequent upon the performance of the last judgment? Whilst then there is so much to give probability on this subject to the statements of Swedenborg, and nothing which, fairly estimated, detracts at all from their credibility; whilst all the particulars advanced, when their causes are understood, are found to be in the strictest agreement both with Scripture and Reason; they surely may be pressed upon the Candid and Reflecting as in the highest degree worthy of their attention, because conveying information of the highest interest to man as an immortal.

---

## SECTION VII.

*The Trinity, as centered in the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ.*

Having gone through all the “curious” subjects objected against in the sentiments held by us as those of the New Church predicted under the figure of a New Jerusalem,—being chiefly those which are connected with our Views of the Eternal World and State,—I am now to appeal to you, my Reflecting and Candid Readers, in regard to our Doctrines of Faith and Life. This is the part of the general subject which is, in reality, of far the highest importance: it is the part of the subject, also, on which every well-disposed mind, having the Word of God to refer to, may most readily determine whether our sentiments are well founded: and it is the part of the subject in regard to which, as we think, we are able most conclusively to evince, that our sentiments are those of the Word of God itself. Were I then to adopt that course which I should most prefer, I should dwell most at length on our Doctrines of Faith and Life; and then again appeal to you to judge, whether

a writer who, like the illustrious Swedenborg, was enabled to present, in so clear a light, the certain dictates of truth upon every subject in which we are most interested as Christians, and so completely to clear the clouds which have so long hung over the doctrinal interpretation of Holy Writ; and who has done this, as he assures us, by virtue of a special illumination, bestowed on him as the herald of the second advent; could possibly be deceived in this assertion, or in anything else which he advances. But, as observed above, I here am compelled to direct my course in the direction marked out for me by our opponents, and particularly by the Rev. Mr Beaumont. As he has filled the greatest part of his *Anti-Swedenborg* with observations and extracts intended to throw ridicule on the views of the eternal world and state presented in the writings of Swedenborg, and on the character of Swedenborg himself; and as these also are the subjects in regard to which the most unfounded and injurious prejudices prevail; I have devoted the greater part of this Appeal to the examination of them on their own merits: and I trust it has sufficiently appeared, that, when the whole of the statements of Swedenborg respecting them is understood, all must be admitted to be securely established on the immovable basis of Scripture, Reason, and Fact. Mr B., however, has not left our more important doctrinal sentiments unassailed; on the contrary, he has put out all his strength in an attempt to overthrow the most important of them all,—that which presents the Lord Jesus Christ as the Being in whose single Person the whole of the Divine Trinity centers,—as being, himself, the Person of the Father, and thus the proper Object of Christian worship. Mr B. is hostile to this doctrine, evidently, because it overturns his erroneous views of the Atonement and Mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ; the true nature of which, as exhibited in the doctrines of the New Church, he likewise assails with gross misrepresentations. He also occasionally throws some unjustifiable slurs on our sentiments in regard to the Christian Life. These three subjects then, I propose, as briefly as their importance will admit, to discuss in this and the two following Sections: and so to conclude this Appeal.

That the doctrine of the New Jerusalem respecting



the Divine Being and the Trinity in the Divine Nature should be fixed upon by any as an object of attack; that, on the contrary, it should not be eagerly accepted by all who assume the Christian name, as relieving them from difficulties which all ingenuous minds are well aware are not a little embarrassing; are facts which, to us who have embraced it, would appear astonishing, were we not conscious of the power which received opinions and early prejudices always exercise over the judgment of weak and fallible man. All acknowledge, at least in words, that God is and can be but one: yet when it is affirmed, as is done by the majority, that this One God exists in Three Persons, each of whom, "*by himself*" (as the Athanasian Creed expresses it,) is God and Lord; a perplexity and confusion are introduced into our conceptions, which many find to be distressing in the extreme. To escape from the embarrassment, numbers have rejected the idea of a Trinity in the Divine Nature altogether; and not seeing how to connect this rejection with an acknowledgment of the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, have refused the honors of divine worship to the Saviour of the world. In the midst of these contending opinions it is, that the New Church, which they who have embraced it believe to be prefigured by the New Jerusalem of the Revelation, addresses itself to the Candid and the Reflecting. We see in Scripture too decisive evidence of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, to suffer us, with the Unitarian, to call it in question: on the other hand, we find too strong declarations of the indivisible unity in the Divine Nature, to allow us, with the Trinitarian, to portion it out between three separate persons. (We take all that is true in the system of each, separated from all that is false.) The doctrine of the Tripersonality was first invented, because those who framed it saw no other means of preserving some acknowledgment of the divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ: and we agree with them, that this acknowledgment is indispensable, in order that any true church may exist. The doctrine of Unitarianism has been introduced, because they who framed it saw no other way to preserve inviolate the perfect unity of the Godhead: and we agree again with them, that where this is in any degree departed from, no true church can exist. Both

(I think) ...

these mischiefs are completely avoided in the doctrines of the New Church, as drawn from the Scriptures in the writings of Swedenborg. May I not then appeal to the Candid and Reflecting, of all Denominations, and ask, whether such a system of doctrine ought not to be looked at by all with respect; whether it might not be reasonably concluded, that it would excite violent hostility in none, but would be accepted by multitudes of sincere Christians with thankfulness and eagerness? That it is entitled to such acceptance, because it not only proposes what is obviously desirable, but establishes what is certainly true; we will endeavor in some degree to evince.

I shall take it for granted that all parties will admit, that the unity of God is a doctrine most perpetually insisted upon by Scripture, and constantly held forth as the fundamental idea on which all true religion is erected. I shall also take it for granted, that, though the word "Trinity" does not occur in Scripture, we repeatedly find the idea properly intended by that term; since we everywhere read, in the New Testament, of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as equally concerned in the great work of man's salvation. I shall further assume, that there are a great many passages likewise which ascribe Divinity to the Lord Jesus Christ; for even the deniers of his divinity admit this, though, not knowing how to reconcile this doctrine with that of the unity, they endeavor to explain away their force. On the admission, then, that these three doctrines are explicitly affirmed in Scripture—so affirmed that they naturally result from the sense of the words themselves; how are they to be combined into one coherent sentiment? The fundamental doctrine of the Divine Unity implies, that the doctrine of the Divine Trinity must not be so strained as to be set at variance therewith, as is done when the Trinity is understood to be a trinity of separate persons in the usual acceptation of that term. It must then be a trinity of Essential Principles,—of Constituent Elements (so to speak, for want of better terms), forming together One Person. And if the Divinity of Jesus Christ is also certain,—thus if he is God at all, and yet God is but One, who can he be but that One Person? In him, as he decidedly declares, the Father

dwelleth: “the Father, *that dwelleth in me*, he doeth the works:”\*—he must then be the person of the Father. From him, or out of him from the Father within him, as he also declares, the Holy Ghost proceedeth: “the Comforter,—whom *I* will send unto you *from* the Father:”† to represent, also, his sending of which, “he *breathed* on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost.”‡ Does it not then appear, that, properly, the Father is the Divine Essence; the Son, the Manifestation of that Essence in a Personal Form; and the Holy Spirit, the Sanctifying Energy and Influence—the Divine Life—thence proceeding to operate the graces of salvation in the human mind? This is a general view of the Doctrine of the New Church upon this subject: I do not propose here to go at large into the *direct* proof of it: but I will shape my remarks so as to meet all the objections which, as far as I am aware, can be raised against it. Thus, though by a different method, I trust we shall arrive at complete proof of the doctrine proposed. §

The objections to the doctrine that the whole Divine Trinity is centered in the Lord Jesus Christ, whose Person is thus the person of the Father, are chiefly drawn from these two sources: *First*, from the belief, that the Being who became incarnate was a Son of God born from eternity: here, therefore, I shall endeavor to shew, that the phrase, *Son of God*, is the proper title of the Humanity born in time, and that the Being who assumed that Humanity was the One Jehovah: *Secondly*, objections are raised from the fact, that Jesus Christ, while in the world, sometimes spoke as if the Father were a separate Being from Himself: here, therefore, I shall endeavor to shew, that, while in the world, he was engaged in the work of glorifying his Humanity, or making it divine, as part of his great work of redemption: thus

\* John xiv. 10.

† Ch. xv. 26, ch. xvi. 7.

‡ Ch. xx. 22.

§ I have collected some of the direct evidence for this important doctrine in a tract entitled, *The True Object of Christian Worship demonstrated, and the Doctrine of the Divine Trinity elucidated*, &c. printed for the Missionary and Tract Society of the New Jerusalem Church, and published by the printer of this work. I could wish that this Tract might be read in connexion with the present Section.

that so long as he was in the world there was a part of his nature which was not divine; but that the work of glorifying the whole was completed at his resurrection and ascension; that all belonging to him was then divine; and that thus he now ever liveth and reigneth, with the Father an Indivisible One, the Only God of heaven and earth.

I. I am then, *first*, to meet the objections arising out of the belief, that the Being who became incarnate was a Son of God born from eternity, by shewing, that the phrase, *Son of God*, is the proper title of the Humanity born in time, and that the Being who assumed it was the One Jehovah.

The idea of a Son of God born from eternity includes such a contradiction in terms, that, if those who entertain it will pardon the remark, we may well wonder how it could ever have found a propounder; especially when, on searching the scriptures, we discover, that nothing whatever countenancing such a notion is there to be found. Had there been such a being as a Son of God existing from eternity, governing the universe in conjunction with his Father, and the Head and particular Ruler of the church, is it to be supposed, that the church could have been left, for four thousand years, in total ignorance of his existence? Yet such is incontrovertibly the fact. The Old Testament, which contains the records of all the churches that ever appeared on this globe, from the creation till the coming of the Lord, never once speaks of a Son of God as then actually existing: it speaks indeed, prophetically, of a Son of God who, in the fulness of time, was *to be* born, but never makes the slightest allusion to a Son of God then born already.

Seeing then that Moses and the prophets give us no information about a proper Son of God as existing when that part of the Divine Code was composed, we must come to the New Testament for instruction; where the term is often used, and always in reference to the Lord Jesus Christ. And of all the places in which it here occurs, perhaps that in Luke i. 35, is best adapted to convey a full insight into its meaning. It is there applied by the angel Gabriel to the Lord Jesus Christ at his birth, or rather, prior to his birth, in a manner which



plainly intimates that there was no Son of God before. In the other gospels, this epithet is given to Jesus Christ, or is assumed by him: but in this passage of Luke we learn the origin of the title, and the reason of it. Had there been a Son of God already existing, and it was this which became incarnate and was born of the virgin, we undoubtedly should have had some intimation of it when the angel announced to her the approaching event. He surely would have made some mention of the Being who was about to assume Humanity by her means. He would not merely have told her, that that Holy Thing which *should* be born of her *should* be called *the Son of God*; but, that *the Son of God who had existed from eternity, was about*, by her instrumentality, *to come into the world*. No such thing. He says: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the Power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that *Holy Thing* which *shall* be born of thee *shall* be called *the Son of God*." Here is express mention of the *Holy Ghost*, and of the *Highest*, or *Father*, as operating in the divine conception; but nothing is said of a Son from eternity as being in any way concerned: and the omission most plainly implies, what all the perceptions of common sense must be outraged before we can doubt, that the Son does not assist to produce himself, nor exist before he is born. The *Holy Thing* that *was to be* born, it is said, *should* be called *the Son of God*; and so called, not because it had already been born from eternity, but *because* (what else does the illative particle, "*therefore*," intend?—because) it was *now first conceived* of the Holy Ghost and the Father.

Here, also, is another circumstance which it is impossible for the tripersonalist to reconcile with his creed: that the Holy Ghost, as well as the Highest or Father, is represented as standing in the relation of a parent to the Son of God. It is commonly believed, that the Holy Ghost is a distinct personal being, separate from both the Father and the Son: if so, then, according to the angel Gabriel, the Son had two distinct fathers. The Athanasian Creed says, that "the Son is of the Father *alone*, neither made, nor created, but begotten:" but the angel Gabriel positively declares, that the Son is of the Holy Ghost *and* the Highest, begotten alike of

both. How evident then it is, that, before we can have clear and consistent notions of the Divine Incarnation, we must not only dismiss from our minds the wild belief of a Son of God born from eternity, but also, that equally extravagant and unscriptural notion, the separate personality of the Holy Ghost.

The whole subject, however, loses its imputed character of incomprehensibility, and becomes, agreeably to the divine promise, plain; and the words of the angel Gabriel in particular, become easy to understand; when we know that the trinity in the Divine Nature does not consist of three Persons, but of three Principles or Elements in one Person. "*The Highest*," which is the term used by the angel instead of "the Father," most clearly denotes the *Inmost* Principle of Deity, or the Essence of the Divine Nature. Unquestionably, God is called the Highest or most High, not in reference to any station which he occupies in space; for God is independent of space and no more stationed in one place than in another. He who is Omnipresent, cannot literally be either high or low. The reason then of his title of Most High, is, because he is the Inmost, being everywhere present as the inmost source of the life and existence of all things. And, with respect to the three Essentials of his own Nature, it must be his Inmost Divinity which is called the Highest. So when, elsewhere, this Inmost Principle is called the Father, it is, because the essence of Deity is Love, and Love is the Great Parent of all. The Holy Ghost or Holy Spirit, in like manner, is not a separate Person, but is the Divine Emanation of influences and energies proceeding from the Divine Being, by which all things are kept in existence, and especially by which the graces of heavenly life are imparted to human minds. Much the same is meant by *the Power* of the Highest as by the Holy Spirit: for as the Highest denotes the Divine Essence, so the Power of the Highest denotes the influence and operation thence proceeding; only there is this difference in the import of the two phrases; that the Holy Spirit means the Divine Emanation of life and influence more with respect to the Divine Truth and Wisdom, and the Power of the Highest is the same Divine Emanation more with reference to

the Divine Goodness and Love. What then can be "that Holy Thing," "the Son of God," conceived by the energy of these two Principles within the sphere of Humanity, but themselves, and consequently the Highest with them, brought into open manifestation, concentrated in a Divine Human Form, and thus adapted to be an Object both of the love and perceptions of finite and infirm human minds?

The consequence of this assumption of Humanity by Jehovah, was, the redemption of mankind, by the subjugation of the powers of hell, which could not otherwise have been approached and conquered; and the communication of saving energies for the restoration of fallen man, with an efficacy which could no otherwise be obtained. But respecting this part of the subject we shall have occasion to say more in the next Section.

We may now have advanced as much as was necessary to elucidate this branch of our argument. We were to meet the objections arising out of the belief, that the Being who became incarnate was a Son of God born from eternity, by shewing, that the phrase, Son of God, is the proper title of the Humanity born in time, and that the Being who assumed it was the One Jehovah. This has, I trust, sufficiently appeared: and with it, we have in some degree seen, how much light the view proposed throws upon the great doctrine of the Trinity.\*

II. I am next to meet the objections which are raised from the fact, that the Lord Jesus Christ, while in the

\* It may be necessary to observe, that we are not to conclude from the fact, that there was no Son of God born from eternity, that therefore there was no Trinity from eternity. Though there was not such a Trinity as since the incarnation, there must always have been a Divine Essence, a Divine Form, and a Divine Influencing Power. As the Divine Essence is identical with the purely Divine Love, the Divine Form is identical with the purely Divine Truth, which is the Word, of which it is said in the beginning of John that it was made flesh, or assumed the ultimate form of existence. The state of the Divine Trinity before the assumption of Humanity, or before the birth of the Son of God, is compared, by Swedenborg, to the state of an angel or spirit; who has a soul or inmost principle of life, a spiritual body, and a sphere of operation thence: but the state of the Divine Trinity since the assumption of Humanity, is compared to the state of a man in the world, in whom his soul and spiritual body are clothed with a natural body also, and thus have a sphere of activity in the world of nature.

world, sometimes spoke as if the Father were a Being separate from himself. To this end I am to shew, that, while in the world, he was engaged in the work of glorifying his Humanity, or making it Divine, which was part of his great work of redemption; thus, that so long as he was in the world there was a part of his nature which was not divine; but that the work of glorifying the whole was completed at his resurrection and ascension; that all belonging to him was then divine; and that now he ever liveth and reigneth, with the Father an Indivisible One, the Only God of heaven and earth.

It is necessary to be observed, that there was this difference between the Lord Jesus Christ, while in a body of flesh on earth, and all ordinary men: that whereas they take their soul or spiritual part from a human father,\* as well as their body or material from a human mother, and thus are finite human beings as to both, Jesus Christ, having no father but the Divine Father, had his soul or internal part from the Divine Essence; and as the Divine Essence is obviously incapable of division, the Divine Essence Itself, or the Father, was in fact his soul or internal part; while his body or external part including the affections, &c. of the natural man, was all that he took from the mother. So long as he had attached to him this body from the mother, he was necessarily an inhabitant of this material world; nor could he return, as he expresses it in John, to the Fath-

\* It is supposed by many, that nothing is derived by man from his parents except his bodily frame, and that when this has arrived to a certain stage of its growth in the womb, a soul, immediately created for that purpose, is infused into it from God. This notion involves such contradictions, that it is wonderful how any can admit it. How can the human race at the present day be infected with the sin of Adam, as is generally supposed; and how can there be a transmission of mental dispositions and character from ancestors, as experience demonstrates to be the fact, if, as to the only part of us which is capable either of sin, or righteousness, or mental character, we are not Adam's descendants, and have no proper ancestors, but are as much original creations as was Adam himself? How much more rational is Swedenborg's doctrine; that the soul is not an independent principle that lives of itself, but is a spiritual form organized for the reception, from moment to moment, of life from God; which life is received and modified by it according to the peculiar character of the form; the form itself being propagated from the parents, and thus resembling what it was in them, as is the case with the body! Several philosophers have seen that such must be the fact.



er, and “be glorified with the glory which he had with him,”—as the Divine Truth or Word in union with the Divine Good or Love,—“before the world was,”\* until his external part, even to the very body, by the assumption of which “the Word was made flesh,”† was glorified or made diviner nor, till then, was the whole the appropriate Divine Form of the Divine Essence that was resident within, and which was continually endeavoring to bring it into a state of perfect agreement with itself, that it might impart itself to it, and thus dwell in fulness in it, as the soul in its body. Thus our Lord’s state by birth bore an exact analogy to man’s state by birth. Man has, we know, an internal man and an external man, which are by birth in opposition to each other, the internal man inclining to heavenly things, and the external only to earthly things; wherefore man, before he can be elevated to heaven, must be regenerated, that is, his external man must be formed anew, so as to become the image of the internal, and to incline, like it, to heavenly things, and only to earthly in subordination to heavenly. But that which, in our Lord, may be called his internal man, was Jehovah, or the Essential Divinity itself; but his external man, being taken from a human parent, was merely human and finite, and partook of human, finite, and earthly things; wherefore, before the Lord could return to complete oneness with the Father, his external man was to be formed anew, so as to become the exact image of his internal, thus, like it, divine and infinite. Now this renewal of his external part was going on during the whole course of his life in the world.

That the Lord was not born divine as to his external part, but only as to his internal part, is generally known: but that he was continually engaged in rendering his external part divine also, which at last was completely effected, is as generally overlooked. That, as to his external man, he advanced in intelligence as well as in bodily growth, is evident from the declaration of Luke, that “the child Jesus grew in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man;” where by his growing in favor with God and man, is meant his approximation to

\* John xvii. 5.

† Ch. i. 14.

union with his divinity, and his reception of divine principles from his Divine Essence in his Humanity. The same truth is further evident from the circumstance, that he is stated to have been about thirty years old before he entered on his public ministry. This is a fact which cannot possibly be accounted for on any principles but ours. Can it be supposed that these thirty years, of the history of which only two or three particulars are recorded, were spent by him in doing nothing? Would a Divine Being have remained so long in a body taken from the elements of this world, were there not a gradual process going on essential to the accomplishment of the work for which he came into this world, and previous to the arrival at a certain stage of which he was not in a capacity of working those miracles, and of speaking those words of eternal Truth, by which his public career was distinguished? When he had so far advanced to oneness with the Father that his external man, by which he spoke and acted in the world, was open even to him, that is, was in immediate communication with his Divine Essence, (of which the descent of the dove at his baptism, as a symbol of the Holy Spirit, or Divine Life flowing into him immediately from his Divine Essence, was the token,) he went about the world performing the wonderful works which are recorded of him; and when his external man was perfectly united with the Father, thus was rendered divine by the full reception of the divine Essence in all its faculties, he appeared on earth no longer, but ascended up into heaven "and sat on the right hand of God."\* By this phrase is not meant that he literally sat down by the side of another Divine Person; but, as the hand is the part of the body by which all its powers are exerted, it is always used in the Word to signify power; as is also the practice in many eastern nations at the present day: hence by the right hand of God is signified Divine Omnipotence, to the possession of which the Lord, as to his Human Nature, was now exalted: as he says himself, in reference to the same subject in Matthew, "All power"—all authority or dominion—"is given unto me in heaven and in earth."\* "*All power*" is Omnipotence, and by "*me*," he means the Human Nature, now One with the Divine.

\* See also above.

We are now in possession of all that is requisite to the solution of all the objections to the doctrine of the sole Divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ, which are drawn from the fact, that, while in the world, he sometimes spoke as if the Father were a Being separate from himself. So long as he was in the world, we have seen there was a part of his nature which was not divine; and so far as the sphere of his thoughts descended into it, he would have a sense of separate existence. Thus there are various occasions in which Jesus is recorded to have prayed to the Father, and at some times with the greatest distress and anxiety; the reason of which was, because he was then in his state of humiliation, or the sphere of his consciousness was chiefly in the infirm Humanity taken from the mother; and, being engaged in combats with the infernal hosts, these at such times prevailed so far, as to shut out the perception of communication with his Divine Essence, and to occasion doubt to his unglorified human nature whether its union therewith could ever be effected, and, of consequence, whether the salvation of the human race, which depended upon that union, could be accomplished. Man, in his Christian progress, undergoes states in some degree similar: for he cannot always be kept in a state of elevation, in the perception of those heavenly principles which he has received by the internal man from the Lord; but he sometimes sinks into the external man merely, and finds himself there so beset with impressions opposite to heavenly ones, as to be brought to doubt whether he has ever really received anything of a heavenly nature or not. Such, also, was the case with our Lord; except that his internal part was not only, as with others, formed by principles of goodness and truth received from the Divine Being, but Divine Goodness and Truth themselves; and that in his external part he had to combat with the whole infernal host, under forms of horror and overwhelming terror that would infallibly have destroyed any merely finite being—any man whose soul was any other than Divinity itself. No wonder then if, when in such states, he sometimes appeared at a distance from his Father, and prayed to him in a manner that might lead us to regard him as a Being different from himself! At other times he gives thanks to the Father; which, though

not implying so great an idea of distance as in the former cases, still conveys to the uninformed mind an idea of separation. To give thanks to the Lord, in the language of Scripture, implies an acknowledgment, that all that we receive, which is the subject of our thanks, is from him. And when Jesus gives thanks to the Father the meaning is the same; he acknowledges by the action, that it is from his Divine Essence that Divine Love, Wisdom and Life, are imparted to his Humanity. Our Lord, accordingly, constantly declares that he does nothing of himself, but that "the Father that dwelleth in him, he doeth the works;" by which he instructs us, that his Humanity alone, were it separate from his Divinity, would be powerless, but that by union with the Divinity it has Omnipotence. This may be clearly illustrated by the case of the soul and body of man: the body separate from the soul would be a mass of dead matter; but in union with the soul it has all the power of the soul in it: nay, further: the soul, without the body would have no power whatever in this world of nature to which the body belongs; and just so, when man had sunk into a merely natural state, the divine influences were rendered incapable of affecting him in a saving manner, till they had invested themselves with the requisite instrument, by clothing themselves with a Humanity capable of making them felt in that sphere of life in which man then stood. It would, however, be absurd, because the body has nothing but what it receives from the soul, to regard the body as a distinct person from the soul; nor is it less so, because all the power of the Lord's Humanity is a consequence of the Divinity's dwelling within it to consider it as a distinct person from the Father. Accordingly, it was only while the work of glorification was in progress that Jesus either prayed to the Father or gave him thanks. After it was accomplished he never did either the one or the other; but although, for the sake of conveying the notion of Divinity and Humanity in the Lord, distinct mention continues to be made of the Son and of the Father, both in the gospels after the resurrection and in the Apocalypse throughout, *there is no hint whatever of any address from the one to the other.* Only let this fact be fairly looked at, and it must be seen to be decisive. From the period of the resurrection,



there is no hint whatever of any address of any kind from the Son to the Father or from the Father to the Son; all trace of inferiority on the part of the Son disappears: the angelic hosts, with equal reverence, sing, "Blessing and honor, glory and power, be unto him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb, forever and ever." The reason is, because, the union between them being fully accomplished, all the Divine Essence belongs equally to the Humanity, and the Humanity is the perfect form and adequate instrument of action of the Divine Essence. While this work was in progress only, our Lord prayed and gave thanks to the Father— ascribed all to him; but after its accomplishment he does so no longer, because there is no longer anything in him which is not absolutely one with the Father: on the contrary, he now assumes to himself the most absolute and incommunicable of the Father's attributes; as when He says, "I am Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the Ending, the First and the Last, who is, who was, and who is to come, the Almighty."

Thus, when it is known that there was no Son of God born from eternity but this is the proper title of the Humanity born in time; and when it is known that this Humanity, though not divine when born, was rendered such by a process which it was undergoing during the whole period of our Lord's existence on earth; it is obvious that all the objections to the doctrine of the New Church respecting the Divine Trinity, as concentrated in the Glorified or Divine Person of the Lord Jesus Christ, fall completely to the ground; and we see how it is true, that, notwithstanding his having appeared in the form of an ordinary man in the world,—in a form which was liable to infirmities, to sufferings, and to death,—he now ever liveth and reigneth, with the Father an Indivisible One, the only God of heaven and earth.

We will confirm this truth by one or two general observations.

It is certain, that the one God has, from the beginning of creation, manifested himself to his people under various characters, expressed by various names, suited to their various states of necessity. Thus we find God saying to Moses, "I am Jehovah; and I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, by the name of God Al-

mighty; but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them.”\* Whether this name was altogether before unknown, is disputed among commentators: but it evidently was either first assumed, or was assumed anew, at the founding of the Israelitish Church by the calling of Moses: was it not then to be expected, that, when God founded the Christian Church, the character of which, compared with all that preceded it, was so entirely new, he would again manifest himself by an entirely new name? Now we may be certain that he never called himself by a new name, but in reference to some new manifestation of his character: was it not then to be concluded, that when he should appear in the character of Redeemer, it would be with some new development of the infinite perfections which are comprised in his essence; yet that it could not be as a separate Divine Person; just as, when he manifested himself as Jehovah to Moses, it was under a new character, but without any difference as to person from that in which he was known as God Almighty? Accordingly, both prophets and evangelists unite in proclaiming that such is the fact. Isaiah declares, over and over again, that the Being who redeems the church and human race is Jehovah; and not only so, but that Jehovah the Redeemer is he that formed the human race, that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the heavens *alone*, that spreadeth abroad the earth *by himself*. It is impossible for words to be framed to express more strongly the Sole Divinity of the Speaker, or to declare more explicitly, that the Redeemer of the church is the Only God. “*Thus saith Jehovah thy Redeemer, and he that formed thee from the womb: I am Jehovah that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the earth by myself.*”† What can be more clear? especially when coupled with the declarations of the chapter preceding, where we read, “*I, even I, am Jehovah, and beside me there is no Saviour.*”‡ But Jesus is constantly called *the Saviour*

\* Ex. vi . 2, 3,

† Isa. xlv. 24. See also the two preceding verses. Our translators here use the word *Lord*; but in the original it is Jehovah, which is far more expressive.

‡ Ch. xliii. 1.

in the New Testament: nay, the very name, *Jesus*, means the *Saviour*: but Jehovah declares, that beside himself there is *no Saviour*: the very name, *Jesus*, the *Saviour*, involves then a blasphemy, unless the being who owns it is the alone Jehovah. How clearly, too, is this established by the declarations of Jesus himself! When Philip blindly thought of the Father as a separate Person, and said, "Lord, shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us;" Jesus answered, "Have I been so long with you, and yet *hast thou not known me*, Philip? *He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?*"\* It is impossible for language to be more explicit; and I have never seen any attempt to explain it to any but in the New-church sense, which did not wear the character of most miserable subterfuge, most palpable violence. Thus, while the Old Testament openly declares, that there is no Saviour beside Jehovah, and no Creator but Jehovah the Redeemer, the Redeemer of the New Testament corroborates the testimony with his solemn assurance, that there is *no Father*, that is, no Jehovah, *out of him*. If he that hath seen him hath seen the Father, it can only be, because HE IS HIMSELF THE PERSON OF THE FATHER, who dwells in him as the soul dwells in the body. Hence he is the proper Object of worship. As, when we address a man's body, we address his soul at the same time; and in fact, if he is a sincere man, we see his soul in his body, because it shines through it, and causes it to express all its sentiments; so, when we address the Lord Jesus Christ, we at the same time address the Father; and, in fact, we see the Father in him; because his person is "the brightness of the Father's glory, and *the stamped impression of his substance*"† (as the original of that passage expressed it,—not *person*, according to the sense now attached to that term, because the Father, since the coming of Jesus Christ, has no Personal Form distinct from his.)

Altogether, then, I trust, the Candid and Reflecting will admit, that these first truths of theology are most certain, and assailable by no valid objection: that as there is, and can be, but One God, so the Lord Jesus Christ is He:

\* John xiv. 9.

† Heb. i. 3.

that in his Glorified Person the whole Trinity centers; the Divine Essence, or Father, being his Divine Soul, the Divine Manifestation, or Son, being his Divine Form, and the Divine Influencing Power, or Holy Spirit, being his Divine Effluent Life and Operation: thus that the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ is the proper Person of the Father, and is the sole Dispenser of the gifts of salvation.

---

## SECTION VIII.

### *The Atonement and Mediation of Jesus Christ.*

I AM NOW to address to the Candid and Reflecting some remarks on the Atonement and Mediation of the Lord Jesus Christ. These are subjects on which tomes innumerable have been written; and certainly, to present our views respecting them with such fulness as the labors which have been bestowed on building up and fortifying the commonly received sentiments might seem to demand, would require at least a whole volume of moderate dimensions. As, however, I have determined, in this work, to treat at greatest length those subjects in regard to which our views are generally thought most strange, which are those relating to the eternal world and state, and to the claims of the enlightened Swedenborg to attention as a particular Instrument for making known the truths to be discovered at the Lord's second coming; I shall treat this, like the other principal doctrinal sentiments which I am called here to discuss, with much brevity. I shall simply propose and explain what we believe to be the truth: I shall offer the system which, in our estimation, explains all the phenomena of cause: and shall leave the reader, for himself, to apply it to the detection of the fallacies, which compose, or support, the more prevailing doctrines.

“All things,” says a great authority, “are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath committed unto us the ministry of reconciliation;



To wit; that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.”\*

The Apostle here delivers, in one single sentence, the whole doctrine of the Atonement; and to call attention to it he propounds it in the most express and formal manner. “*God hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ.*” and the ministry of this reconciliation, committed to the Apostles, was, to declare this truth; “to wit, that *God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.*” The word here translated *reconciliation*, is the same as is elsewhere rendered *atonement*: it cannot then be denied, that the Atonement of Scripture is nothing else but our reconciliation with God, effected by the dwelling of God in the person of Jesus Christ.†

\* 2 Cor. v. 18, 19.

† The above text might therefore with equal propriety be rendered thus: “All things are of God, who hath *atoned* us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath committed unto us the word of *atonement*; to wit, that God was in Christ, *atoning* the world unto himself,” &c. At present the word *atonement* occurs only once in the New Testament. That is in Rom. v. 11, where the apostle says, “And not only so but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the *atonement.*” It is not a little extraordinary, that a word which occurs but once in the whole of the New Testament, from which more especially Christians profess to derive their creed, should have come to occupy so great a space in the language of the theology of the day. And it is more extraordinary still, that it should have come to be supposed that the Lord made an atonement *to the Father*, thus that the atonement was *received by the Father*, when yet it is said, in the only text of the New Testament where the word occurs, that it is *we who have received the atonement*. The reason is, because the proper meaning of the word has been little attended to; which is, as stated above, *reconciliation*. This was the only meaning which the word bore when the Scriptures were translated; although, like the words *person*, *ghost*, and others, it has since assumed a different signification; and men have been too much influenced in their religious sentiments, by the changes which have gradually taken place in the meaning of words. In every other place, the same word, and its corresponding verb, are translated *reconciliation*, and *to reconcile*. Thus in the verses preceding that just quoted from Romans, our translators say, “For if when we were enemies we were *reconciled* to God by the death of his Son, much more, being *reconciled*, we shall be saved by his life:” then follows, “And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have received the *atonement.*” Here then *atonement* is used as the answering substantive to the verb *to reconcile*. *Atonement*, is literally *at-one-ment*;—the state of being

The Rev. Mr Beaumont affirms, that we deny this ministry of reconciliation; and quotes, as if they were against us, instead of being, as is the fact, entirely confirmatory of our doctrines, such texts as speak of the Lord Jesus Christ as having become a sacrifice for us, or as having, as Paul in one place explicitly states, "given himself as an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savor." And he says, "But if we may not, as Baron Swedenborg would teach us, view Christ as a sacrifice for sin, then we require of the Swedenborgians to tell us, what the Mosaic sacrifices were types of: for according to their doctrine, those sacrificial types had no antitypes." This paragraph displays such utter ignorance respecting what our doctrines are, as is inexcusable in one who undertakes to write against them. Our doctrines never teach that we may not view Christ as a sacrifice for sin; but they shew, on the contrary, how he truly was such, and rectify the great mistakes which many entertain in regard to what a Scriptural sacrifice is: and, so far from making the Mosaic sacrifices types without antitypes, they bring their antitypes to view in a more clear and satisfactory manner than was ever before accomplished.

*First*, then, we will shew, that the sacrifices of the Mosaic law were not meant to represent the punishment of sin; but, on the contrary, that they represented the hallowing of every affection and principle of the mind, and thus of the whole man, to the Lord. *Secondly*, that the sacrifice of Jesus Christ did not consist in his suffering the punishment due to sin, but in his hallowing every principle of his Human Nature to the Godhead, till at length his Human Nature became a living sacrifice, or thing fully consecrated, sanctified, and hallowed, by perfect union with his Divinity. *Thirdly*, That the Lord is called a Mediator in respect to his Humanity, because in this he has opened to us a new and living way of access, or Medium of approach, to his Divinity.

*at one, or in agreement.* See Acts vii. 26, 1 Macc. xiii. 50, 2 Macc. i. 5, vii. 33. Though the word *atonement* occurs but once in the New Testament it is often used in the Old, but always in the sense of *reconciliation*. Doubtless, then, the atonement of Christian doctrine is *reconciliation with God*, including the means by which reconciliation is effected.

I. First, then, we are to shew, that the sacrifices of the Mosaic law were not meant to represent the punishment due to sin; but, on the contrary, that they represented the hallowing of every affection and principle of the mind, and thus of the whole man, to the Lord.

The prevailing opinion in regard to the Levitical sacrifices is that first stated; that the slaying of the animal, and the burning of him, or of part of him, on the altar, represented the punishment due to the offerer, and that, in sacrificing the animal, the offerer was considered as entreating that the suffering inflicted upon it might be accepted in lieu of the punishment deserved by himself. This is the notion which the Jewish Rabbins have of the subject; who say also, that a confession of sins was made over the victim, when the offerer laid his hand upon its head, and thus that the sins were considered as transferred to the animal, and punished in him instead of the offerer. It is however certain, that this is merely one of the traditions of the Jews, by which, as in so many other instances, they have perverted the divine law; for although the offerer was commanded to lay his hand upon the head of the victim, *not one word is said in the Scriptures of any confession of sins to be then made.* The only instance in which a confession of sins accompanied the laying on of the hand, is that of the scape-goat; respecting which Moses commanded, that "Aaron should lay both his hands upon the head of the live goat, and confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the goat."\* But this goat, being thus representatively loaded with sins, was considered as unclean, and instead of being sacrificed, was sent away into the wilderness: even the man that was employed to send him away was considered as contaminated by the operation, and rendered unclean also, so that he was required to wash his clothes and bathe his flesh in water, before he was allowed to return into the camp.† Seeing then, when it was intended that a confession of sins should be made over a victim, the command for it is so expressly given, can it be supposed that a similar confession was intended to be made over

\* Lev. xvi. 21.

† Ver. 26.

all the victims, when it is never commanded at all? And when the representative effect of this confession of sins over an animal was to render him unclean, so that to have offered him up in sacrifice would have been an abomination, and the only orderly way of disposing of him was to send him away into the wilderness, to denote the rejection of man's sins, separated from himself, to hell from whence they came; can it be supposed that the animals actually sacrificed were in like manner rendered unclean, by a similar confession of sins being made over them, and thus a similar representative transfer of sins to them? The idea is monstrous in the extreme; it is such as could only have been invented by the Jews who wrote upon the ceremonies of the ancient law long after those ceremonies had ceased to be performed. The books of Jewish writers are full of similar groundless fancies, which either originated with themselves, or, if they are traditions handed down from others, belong to the class of those traditions which are condemned by the Lord Jesus Christ as making the law of God of none effect. Accordingly, the learned, who long mistakenly looked to the Jews as the natural expositors of the law of Moses, are now generally convinced that to follow them is to follow blind guides indeed, and that the only way of learning how the laws of Moses were originally obeyed, is, by studying the laws themselves, as they are still extant in the books of Moses, and to take nothing upon the mere authority of the Jewish scribes which is not there clearly implied.\* But alas! the learned had not made the discovery, that Jewish Rabbins are very unsafe guides, before they had transferred a great portion of their doctrines into their system of Christianity. The Rabbinical notion that the animal slain in sacrifice was put to death in lieu of the offerer as a substituted victim, the sins of the offerer being considered as transferred to him, has entered very deeply into most systems of modern theology, and forms in them so fundamental a part, that you cannot take it away without throwing down the whole. Christian teachers, indeed, do not, with the Jews, consider that the slaying of an animal in sacrifice had any virtue in itself, but they transfer to the

\* See Michaelis's Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, *passim*.



sufferings and death of Jesus on the cross, all that the Jews have feigned respecting their animal sacrifices. They consider that he died to appease by his sufferings the wrath of the Father; that the sins of all mankind, that is, of all who have faith, were representatively transferred to him, and that he suffered the punishment of them in their stead: all which doctrines are drawn from the Jewish notions of sacrifices, and belong to those traditions by which the law of God is made of none effect.

The reason then why, in all sacrifices, he that offered the sacrifice was directed to put his hand upon the head of the victim, was, not by that act representatively to transfer his sins,—for to do this the sins were to be confessed over him, and that by positive command, as in the case of the scape-goat,—but to express communication between the offerer and his sacrifice, which was necessary to give the animal its representative efficacy. The animals offered in sacrifice represented the good affections of various kinds from which the Lord is to be worshipped; but without this symbol of communication between the offerer and the animal, the latter would not represent any good affection presented by him: to imply that the offerer himself wished to worship the Lord by and from the good affection which the animal represented, it was necessary that he should perform the representative rite of putting his hand upon its head; after which the animal represented a good affection cherished by him, and presented by him to the Lord, from a sincere acknowledgment that everything good is from the Lord alone.

Now that this is the true idea of sacrificial worship, is evident from many parts of Scripture: We will just select one which is completely conclusive. That the putting of the animal to death and burning of it upon the altar, does not represent the punishment due to the offerer, is clear from this circumstance, that the altar, on which the sacrifices were offered, is called, in various places, “the table of the Lord.” Thus the Lord says by the prophet to the priests, “Ye have profaned it (that is, the name of the Lord) in that ye say, The table of the Lord is polluted, and the fruit thereof, even his meat” (the meat, observe, of the Lord), “is contempti-

ble." Again: "Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar: and ye say, Wherein have we polluted thee?" The answer is, "In that ye say, The *table* of the Lord is contemptible."\* Nothing can be more clear, from these and numerous other instances, than that the things offered in sacrifice, and burnt upon the altar, were considered as constituting a *feast*,—were presented as upon a *table* for the Lord to eat; which he was considered to do when they were consumed by fire. This is the reason why it is so often said in Leviticus, that they were to be burnt "for a sweet smelling savor to the Lord." They are expressly called the Lord's *bread*, and his *meat*. Can that then which he is considered to accept as food be the punishment and torments of sinners? Could it be the punishment and torments of his own Son? To suppose that this is what is meant by the slaying of the animals and burning of them on the altar, is indeed to pollute and profane the Lord's table: it is to suppose the altar to be a type of the regions of eternal misery, and to regard him who accepts the offerings upon the altar as the being who presides over, and enjoys with delight, the torments of the lost. Indeed, when we consider the sacrifices in the light of food spread upon the Lord's table for his acceptance, as we find they are represented in the Word, we must necessarily see that no idea of punishment and torments is in them represented. The death of the victim is not regarded as to the idea of punishment, nor is its dying ever spoken of in the appointment of the ceremonial: but the slaying of it is merely considered as a necessary part of the preparation of it for food, and no more conveys the idea of the punishment due to the person who offers it, than that idea is conveyed by the reaping of the corn which was to be presented in the offering of the first-fruits, and which, as well as the animal sacrifices, was consumed upon the altar. Preparation for food is in both cases what is implied. And when either the sacrifices or the meat offerings are placed upon the altar or table of the Lord, they are considered simply in the light of viands of which the Lord was invited to partake.

What then are the viands of which the Lord can

\* Mal. i. 12, 7.

partake in reality? When any allusion is made in Scripture to his hunger, it means, his intense desire that his goodness and love should be received by mankind. On the occasion of his temptation in the wilderness it is said, that "when he had fasted forty days he was afterwards *a hungered*:" where his fasting refers to the depraved state of mankind and of the church in its entire desolation, and his hungering is his intense desire for man's salvation. The hunger of the Lord then is satisfied, when his love and goodness are received by mankind; and this is done, when man receives affections of goodness and truth from him, and returns them to him in sincere adoration, with the heartfelt acknowledgment that they are from him alone.\*

Here then we have a clear idea of the purport of the sacrifices in use in the representative church,—an idea which explains the whole system, and banishes obscurity from every part; whereas on the supposition that they represent the punishment due to sinners, and transferred from them to the Lord Jesus Christ, we find ourselves stumbling amid extravagances and inconsistencies at every step.

But it may perhaps be thought that this view of the subject excludes all reference of the sacrifices to the Lord Jesus Christ. The direct contrary, however, is the fact. All the Mosaic law of sacrifices was fulfilled in, and by, the Lord Jesus Christ, in a supereminent manner, and thus, in its highest sense, it has reference to him: it is only in a subordinate sense, and as followers of him, that it has a spiritual fulfilment in us. We, in our subordinate degree, as walking after him, are to be sacrifices too; but he is the great sacrifice of all.

When man continually receives from the Lord the graces of which he is the author, and ascribes all to him, in the manner represented by the sacrificial worship of the Mosaic law; when every affection and perception of his heart and mind of which the various kinds of sacrifices were representative, or himself in regard to such affections and perceptions, is thus continually hallowed to the

\* See the above view of the sacrifices and of the nature of the divine hunger, further illustrated in the *Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures*.

Lord; it follows, that when his sanctification is completed, the whole man is thus devoutly consecrated. This is the state which the apostle exhorts us to attain, when he says, "I beseech you, brethren, that ye present your bodies *a living sacrifice*, holy, acceptable, unto God; which is your reasonable service."\* Such a *living sacrifice* is a man wholly devoted to the Lord, who is wholly renewed by the reception of new principles of love, thought, and action, from him; whose selfish life is extinct, whilst he lives by a new life, which is life indeed. This the same apostle speaks of as being his own state, when he says, "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me; and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me:"† where, by *the flesh*, and, in the preceding quotation by the *body*, the apostle, as in other parts of his writings, does not merely mean the material body, but all that is called the natural or external man. Here then he clearly describes a state of renovation of the whole man in which he is made a living sacrifice unto God.

II. We now shall be enabled to see the truth of our second proposition: That the sacrifice of Jesus Christ did not consist in his suffering the punishment due to sin,—for if, as we have seen, nothing relating to punishment is included in the Scripture idea of sacrifices, nothing of this could be included in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ;—but that his sacrifice consisted in the hallowing of every principle or element of his Human Nature to the Godhead, till at length his whole Human Nature became a living sacrifice, or thing fully consecrated, sanctified, and hallowed, by perfect union with his Divinity.

We have seen in the last Section, that, whilst the human form which the Lord assumed by birth of the virgin, necessarily partook, at first, of her infirmities, its soul, from conception, was no other than the indivisible Jehovah. So long, then, as has also been shewn, as the human form thus assumed partook at all of what it derived from the mother, it could only receive the communications of the Divine Essence with more or less of

\* Rom. xii. 1.

† Gal. ii. 20.



limitation: in order to its receiving the whole, and becoming properly the Divine Form of the Divine Essence, it was necessary that it should be entirely renewed, by the successive extirpation of the disorderly and finite human forms, and the bringing down, from the Divinity within, of divine forms, into the human and natural degree, to supply their place. To this operation the Lord Jesus alludes on various occasions. Sometimes he refers to the painful part of it, which was the extirpation of what he had from the mother; as when he says, "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!"\* At other times he speaks of the glorious part; as when he says, "Father, glorify me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."† And that this was necessary for man's salvation, he declares when he says, "For their sakes I sanctify myself; that they also may be sanctified through the truth:"‡ where, by sanctifying himself, the Lord means his purifying his Humanity from the infirmities inherited from the mother, and thus rendering it divine. The same thing is frequently spoken of by the apostles: as by Paul, when he speaks of Jesus as being "made perfect through sufferings:"§ the *sufferings* were the temptations and conflicts by which he put off the imperfections inherited from the mother; and the *making perfect* was his rendering the Humanity the perfect image, the appropriate Form and proper Person, of his Divine Soul. The last suffering, by which he wholly put off all that he had received from the mother, was the passion of the cross. By this, all the merely natural life of the finite and material nature was extinguished: and when this was done, the Divine Life flowing down from within (everything uncongenial with it being extinct), descended into the very lowest forms of the human nature, extirpated all that was yet left from the mother, even to the consuming of the material particles; clothed itself with divine forms, still belonging to the human and natural degree, put on in place of what was put off; and so raised his body from the tomb, no longer finite, no longer liable to any of the accidents of the mere creature, but wholly divine, the

\* Luke xii. 50.

† John xvii. 5.

‡ Ver. 19.

§ Phil. iii. 21.

adequate Form for the reception and in-dwelling of the whole Divine Essence. This is his "glorious body," as it is called by the Apostle, after the image of which our spiritual bodies are to be fashioned. Some idea of it may also be conceived from the glorious view granted to the three disciples at the transfiguration:\* what was seen by them was the Divine Person in the sphere immediately within and above that of the material frame. In this Divine Form and Person, therefore, as the Apostle declares, "all the fulness of the Godhead dwelleth bodily:"—in any form and person not altogether divine, it is obviously impossible that *ALL the fulness of the Godhead—the whole infinitude of the Divine Nature*—can dwell. It all is centered in the Person of Jesus, demonstrating that his Person, since his resurrection, is altogether Divine: how vain then must it be to look for the Godhead anywhere else, than in that Divine Form in which the whole of it dwells!

Now admitting this view of the completeness of the sanctification, glorification, or deification, of the Lord's Human Nature to be correct; and admitting at the same time the view above developed of the nature and effect of real spiritual sacrifices as offered by man; and we clearly see how truly the Lord, as to his Humanity, is called a sacrifice. The series of the Mosaic sacrifices, in their complete order, represents the entire sanctification of man, insomuch that the man who spiritually offers them becomes himself a sacrifice,—a thing or being wholly devoted to God, and wholly assimilated, in his finite degree, to the divine image: so, in a higher sense, it represents the complete sanctification or glorification of the Lord's Humanity, whereby this was really devoted to the Divine Essence itself, and entirely assimilated to the Divine Nature, so as to be the actual Form for its bodily in-dwelling. And this is correctly said to be done *for us*: for us this sacrifice was offered, to effect atonement, or reconciliation, between man and God: as Jesus says, "*for their sakes I sanctify myself*;" and as Paul declares, "Christ our passover is sacrificed *for us*;" not because the Father's anger required appeasing, or could be appeased by the sight of the Son's suffer-

\* Mat. xvii. 2.

ings; but because, when the Humanity was thus sacrificed, that is sanctified, and united to the Essential Divinity, the divine influences were accommodated to man's state, so as to be operative to the renewal of his heart and mind,—to his sanctification also. Thus it is most true, as the Apostle observes, that “he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.” It is to put away sin from the mind which receives him that the Holy Spirit is given: and of this it is said, while Jesus was engaged in his ministry on earth, “the Holy Ghost was not yet, because that Jesus was not yet glorified:”\*—not that no divine influences had ever before been afforded; but that such as were adapted to reach and affect man in the state to which he had then fallen, could not be imparted, till the Humanity of Jesus,—the only Divine Principle from which *such* influences can be given, ~~was~~ glorified, that is, sacrificed, that is, deified.

The above observations may also sufficiently explain, how it is that man is saved through the sufferings and death of the Lord Jesus Christ; or through his blood, which, in the Apostolic writings; is constantly used, according to the phraseology of the Jews, as a figurative expression for his sufferings and death. These were not inflicted on him as the proper punishment of our sins: yet were they most truly undergone by him *for us*, and were indispensable to our salvation. They, and especially his last suffering of death, were the means by which his Humanity was glorified. They thus were the means by which we are delivered from hell and raised to heaven, through our reception of the saving graces communicated by the life-giving energies of his Holy Spirit; which could only be imparted to us from the Eternal Jehovah in his Glorified Humanity. Thus it is most strictly true, according to our apprehension of the subject, that “by his stripes we are healed.”

We may now then discern, how truly atonement or reconciliation was made between God and man by the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. The enmity, or contrariety, between man and God, was first abolished in his own person, and in him man, or human nature in general,

\* John vii. 29. Our translators have said, “was not yet *given* ;” but they have marked the word *given* by Italics, to intimate that there is nothing answering to it in the original.

was reconciled to God:\* and then, by his agency and influence, it is abolished in us also, and we are reconciled, and restored to agreement with God, in and by him. In the expressive language of the apostle;† “If, when we were enemies”—when human nature in general was in a state of contrariety,—“we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son,”—the separation was abolished by the glorification of the Human Nature of the Lord Jesus Christ, which is the Son of God, and of which glorification his death was the immediate cause,—“much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life,”—much more, now that the utter separation no longer exists, shall we be endowed with saving graces through the life-giving influences proceeding from him, who ever liveth to make intercession for us,—What reason then have we to “joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, BY WHOM WE HAVE NOW RECEIVED THE ATONEMENT!”‡ Blessed be God, who “HATH ATONED US TO HIMSELF BY JESUS CHRIST!” Adored be the mercy, by which “GOD WAS IN CHRIST ATONING THE WORLD UNTO HIMSELF!”§

III. That the Lord is called a Mediator in respect to his Humanity, because in this he has opened a new and living way of access to his Divinity; must now, I apprehend, be so evident, that it is needless to employ many words in its proof.

We have just alluded to the text in which the apostle says of Jesus, that “he ever liveth to make intercession for us.”|| But by interceding he does not here mean *soliciting* or *entreating*, as a supplicant to a sovereign; nor is there anything in the context to sanction such a gross external idea; but, *acting as a medium*, or as *that which goes between*, which is the strict, literal meaning of the word *to intercede*. Such intercession is the proper office of the Divine Humanity: for this receives into itself the unmitigated fulness of the Divine Essence, and dispenses it to man in a form adapted to his capacities of receiving it; just as a man’s body receives into itself the whole of the powers of his soul, and dispenses its ener-

\* See this truth, which is usually so entirely overlooked, largely proved and insisted on in *Sherlock on Happiness and Punishment in the Next World*, ch. v. § 3.

† Rom. v. 10.

‡ Ver. 11.

§ See the note above.

|| Heb. vii. 25.



gies, in the manner adapted to make them efficient, on persons and things around it. How exactly does the Lord himself describe his action in this interceding or mediatorial character, when he says, respecting the Comforter or Holy Spirit, "whom *I* will send unto you *from the Father*:"\* teaching, that the Divine Essence is the origin of the Divine Influencing Power, but that the Divine Humanity, in which it abides in all its infinite fulness, is the Medium of dispensing its agency on mankind.† How accurately, also, is the true doctrine on

\* John xv. 26.

† The reader, I am sure, will be gratified by seeing the above idea beautifully illustrated by Dr Watts. "The sun in the natural world," he observes, "is a bright emblem of divinity, or the Godhead; for it is the spring of all light and heat and life to the creation.—Now if we should suppose this vast globe of fire, which we call the sun, to be enclosed in a huge hollow sphere of crystal, which should attempt its rays like a transparent veil, and give milder and gentler influences to the burning beams of it, and yet transmit every desirable or useful portion of light or heat; this would be a happy emblem of *the man Christ Jesus, in whom dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*. It is the Lamb of God, who in a mild and gracious manner, conveys the blessings originally derived from God, his Father, to all the saints. We partake of them in our measures in this lower world, among his churches here on earth; but it is with a nobler influence, and in a more sublime degree, the blessings of paradise are diffused through all the mansions of glory, by this illustrious medium of conveyance, Jesus the Son of God." [*Works*, vol. vii. p. 143.] This emblem is as just as it is striking, provided we guard against one or two misapprehensions which may arise from it. Though the Son of God, or the Divine Humanity, is the medium of conveying all blessings to men and angels, we are not to regard it as a mere passive conveyance, but an infinitely active one. He says, "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself:" thus the Divine Energies or Holy Spirit are not simply transmitted from the Divine Essence through the Humanity, but are first received by the Humanity, and thence, by its own life and activity derived from its perfect union with the Divine Essence, dispensed to mankind; precisely as is expressed in the words quoted above, "whom *I* will send unto you *from the Father*. Secondly: although it is true that the rays of Godhead are "attenuated" by the humanity, they are not thereby weakened or blunted; but, on the contrary, are rendered, as to their influence on man, far more penetrating and powerful; so that Watts's crystal sphere must be considered as operating, in regard to man, in the manner of a magnifying lens. Thus the prophet, in regard to the effect on man of the assumption of humanity by Jehovah, uses these strong figures; "In that day, the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days; in the day that the Lord bind-

this subject expressed by the Apostle Paul! "There is one God," says he, "and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus."\* He expressly affirms, that it is the *man* Christ Jesus who is the Mediator. But Jesus is generally allowed to be God as well as man: yet the apostle takes care to guard us from supposing that his Divinity mediates between us and some other Divinity, by thus expressly restricting the office of mediation to his Humanity; hence, also, he never uses the title, "the man Christ Jesus," on any other occasion whatsoever. How plainly does this instruct us, that the Human Nature of the Lord Jesus Christ is the only Medium by which we can have access to his Divine Essence; and that his Divine Essence is not distinct from that of the Father, but is the Father Himself! His essential Divine Nature is what the Apostle calls God, and which he declares to be One: his glorified Human Nature is what he calls *the man* Christ Jesus; and which he also declares to be one, to intimate that the Human Nature in him is essentially different from what it is in all other beings, and is as his Divine, being the adequate organ of conveying to man the divine communications.

It is commonly imagined, from the Lord's being called a Mediator, as well as from his being said to intercede, that he uses entreaty and prayer with the Father in behalf of man. How vain is it for those who believe this to deny, that in heart they believe in at least two Gods, and those, also, of opposite natures! for how can the God who supplicates and entreats be the same God as he who is supplicated and entreated? How can the nature of the God, who, without any feast on another's sufferings to appease his offended justice, entreats and supplicates another God to lay aside his wrath, be the same as that of him who only lays aside his wrath in compliance with such entreaty and supplication; in which

eth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of her wound." (Isa. xxx. 26.) I will only add further, that if the sun enclosed in a crystal sphere is a just emblem of the Father and Son of the Scriptures, we see how impossible it is to regard them as two persons; we see that their relation is precisely that of the soul and the body; and we see how idle it must be to seek for God, anywhere but in the person of Jesus Christ: to which conviction Dr Watts himself is reputed to have arrived before he died.

\* 1 Tim. ii. 5.

also he is continually reminded of the sufferings to which the supplicant has submitted to appease him? Nay, how can the God who cannot raise man to heaven of his own free motion, but must first obtain his forgiveness of another God by prayer and supplication, be any God at all? Does not the supposition fully imply, that the Father and Son are as completely two Gods as any two human beings are two men, and that they differ as much from each other as a subject from an absolute sovereign? All this fiction, also, respecting the Lord's mediating and interceding for man by praying to the Father, has been invented in direct contradiction to his own assurance: "I say NOT unto you," says he, "*that I will pray the Father for you: for the Father himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God.*"\* To believe that the Lord *came out from God*, is to believe that his Humanity is an immediate evolution from his Divine Essence—an actual manifestation of what was always potentially included in the Divinity, ready to be put forth, for the salvation of man, when the fulness of state and time should have arrived. When this is acknowledged, the Father himself is said to love us, because the love which constitutes his essence is then capable of being communicated to us and received by us. Hence again we see that the Lord's Humanity is the Medium by which we gain access to his Divinity, and are brought into communication with it, just as by the medium of a man's body we gain access to, and have communication with, his soul. The Lord teaches the same truth in the most direct form when he says, "I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall go in and out, and find pasture."† What is the door but the medium of access? And that, to obtain such access, we are not to address the naked Divinity immediately, but the Lord Jesus Christ as the Divine Person of the Father, he again teaches when he says, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber."‡

Altogether, it assuredly is abundantly evident, that the Mediatorship of Jesus Christ does not consist in his

\* John xvi. 26, 27.

† John x. 9.

‡ Ver. 1.

introducing us, by entreaty or any other means, to the favor of a God out of and separate from himself; but in his having assumed and glorified a Humanity to afford a Medium of access to the Divinity which dwells in fullness in it. Let us then, instead of thinking to climb up some other way, enter in “by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us through the veil, that is to say, his *flesh*,”\*—that Humanity, which he has deified and united to Deity to be for men the Medium of approach to God.

In conclusion: May not these views of the New Church on the Atonement and Mediation of Jesus Christ be confidently recommended to the consideration of the Candid and Reflecting? Do they not unfold the true doctrine of the Scriptures on these momentous subjects, in a manner which is calculated to recommend the Scriptures themselves to the more cordial acceptance of men of reason and reflection? Do they not satisfactorily clear the Christian Religion from the imputation of sanctioning doctrines at which all reason and common sense revolt, by shewing that the sentiments on those subjects which bear that character are not those of the true Christian Religion, but are the mere fallacious conclusions of gross minds, that have looked at the Scriptures in a merely superficial manner? Do they not evince, that the genuine doctrines of Scripture are here coincident with the views of sound reason and true philosophy? Ought not then the writings of the enlightened Instrument by whom these doctrines are deduced from the Scriptures, to be favorably regarded by all those to whom true philosophy, sound reason, and scriptural theology, are objects of esteem?

---

## SECTION IX.

### *The Christian Life.*

I AM now finally to appeal to you, my Candid and Reflecting Readers, on the subject of the Christian Life; and I trust I shall not find it difficult to convince

\* Heb. x. 20.



you, that when our doctrines affirm, that a life of righteousness, but not of Pharisaic righteousness, is the life that leads to heaven, they affirm the genuine doctrine of the Scriptures.

Among the accusations which have been brought against the doctrines of the New Church, there is none which will appear more extraordinary to future ages, none which at present appears more surprising to those who know what they are, than the monstrous charge of their being opposed to true holiness of life: Yet the Rev. Mr Beaumont has thought proper to affirm, that the enlightened man who was made the instrument of deducing those doctrines from the Scriptures, comes under the condemnation of the Lord's words when he says, "Whosoever shall break one of the least of these commandments, and shall teach men so, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven." He founds this imputation chiefly upon the title of one of the most heavenly chapters in that truly heavenly work, the treatise on Heaven and Hell,—“That it is not so difficult a thing to live for heaven as some suppose,” which he calls “a written prescription for dealing with a slack hand, and being at ease in Zion.” A more artful attempt to raise an unfounded prejudice has seldom been witnessed. The title of the chapter, and the title alone, since no other part of it would suit the purpose, is quoted: a turn is given to it by the manner of introducing it quite different from any that its author ever thought of its bearing; and then the assailant goes on, through two or three pages, moralizing on the “awful responsibility” lying on the writer, the translators, and circulators, of “false doctrines and loose principles;” as if such guilt were incurred by the writer, translators, and circulators, of the doctrines and principles of the New Church! Yet why should it surprise us? when truth has always received the same treatment on its first promulgation, and before its doctrines were so generally known as to make evident to all the falsehood of the accusation. The writings of the early Christian apologists are filled with accounts of the monstrous fictions which were invented to blacken the then new religion and those who received it. All the most celebrated Reformers, at the era of the separation from Rome, were represented as monsters of impiety: an imputation certainly which was grossly

scandalous and unfounded, though I would by no means represent those upon whom it was cast as maintainers of genuine truth. Still less would I affirm this of the modern Methodist: but this is no reason for representing their excesses as worse than they were: yet their severe antagonist, Bishop Lavington, concludes his celebrated work entitled *The Enthusiasm of Methodists and Papists Compared*, with a delineation of abominations which were practised at the Eleusinian mysteries, and intimates his conviction, that the private meetings of the Methodists (and he quotes passages from their writings as countenancing the charge) were not more innocent. But why advert to inferior instances to evince how naturally both genuine and comparative truth, even to the mere zeal for what is believed to be the truth, are maligned and misrepresented on their first appearance? Do the opponents of the doctrines of the new *New Church* strain them to a sense which does not belong to them? the Lord Himself, by his representative, David, complains that his divine sentiments were similarly perverted: "False witnesses did rise up: they laid to my charge things that I knew not;"—"Every day they wrest my words."\* Do they affirm of the doctrines of the *New Church* which are formed from the pure truths of the Word of God, that they teach men to break the divine commandments? The disciple is not above his Master; and the teachers of the professing church said of the Word of God himself, when Incarnate among them, "We know that this man is a sinner."†

The whole of the verse of which a part is so calumniously applied to the illustrious Swedenborg by his accuser, with the verse which follows it, delivers, in the most explicit manner, the Lord's doctrine respecting the species of righteousness which was to distinguish his disciples: "Whosoever," he declares, "shall break one of these least commandments, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven. For I say unto you, Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven."‡ It is here most decisively taught, that a life of

\* Ps. xxxv. 11, lvi. 5.

† John ix. 24.

‡ Matt. v. 19, 20.

righteousness, but not of Pharisaic righteousness is the way to heaven. I propose then to shew, that the doctrine thus advanced is to be understood in all the fulness of meaning which the Lord's words naturally convey; that to invent any interpretation of them which tends to evade their evident purport,—to break, or diminish the force of any of the divine commandments,—is to incur the condemnation which they pronounce; and that the doctrine they teach, is, in all its integrity and purity, the doctrine of the New Church and of the writings of Swedenborg.

By a life of righteousness, it will of course be understood, we mean a life of obedience to the Lord's commandments: and that such obedience is required of all those that call themselves his disciples, is so evident in Scripture, that scarcely any can be so bold as openly to deny it, though many break the force of the commandments respecting it by straining their language to different meaning. The whole of the Bible, both in the Old Testament and the New, is nothing else but the code of God's commandments, with an ample comment respecting the rewards which Divine Goodness bestows on those who keep them, and the punishments which unavoidably overtake those who persevere in disregarding them. Under the Jewish dispensation, the keeping of the commandments of God had rewards in this life attached to it, and the disobeying of them was followed by punishments in this life: and when such disobedience became national, it was to be followed with expulsion from their own country and exile and captivity in foreign lands. Accordingly, when the Jews, having long refused, by obedience to the divine commandments, to render of the fruits of the vineyard to its rightful Lord, proceeded to the direful extent of casting the Divine Heir out of his own vineyard and slaying him, they were finally ejected from being tenants of the vineyard, or from being the recognised church of God in the world; and with it agreeable to the nature of the punishments with which, under that dispensation, disobedience was attended, they were miserably destroyed by foreign invaders, were finally cast out of their own land, and have been abject wanderers in foreign countries ever since; exhibiting a standing monument before our eyes of the awful conse-

quences of disobedience. But many modern teachers will here exclaim, "Yes! but the case is quite different now: they were under a covenant of works, but we are under the covenant of grace." True, I answer, from the doctrines of the New Church: we *are* under the covenant of grace: but in what does this grace consist? In the power which is bestowed upon man, in consequence of the increased divine aids and communications of the Spirit, which are the blessed effects of the Incarnation of Jehovah in the person of Jesus Christ; whereby he is enabled to keep the divine commandments from that inward ground, in the spirit and not in the letter only,—in the heart and mind as well as in the outward form,—which is intended by the Author of those commandments, the God who looketh at the heart. We *are* under grace: "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ:" and "as many as received him to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to as many as believe on his name."\* Believing on his name, then, does not, of itself, make them sons of God, but brings the power of becoming such; in other words, it is indispensably necessary to our receiving from God the power to keep his commandments in the spirit as well as in the letter: and "he that hath my commandments, and keepeth them," saith the Lord Jesus Christ, "he it is that loveth me: and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest myself unto him:"† which is only another mode of declaring, that such shall be sons of God.

If we were to cite all the passages in the discourses of the Lord Jesus Christ in which he declares that the keeping of his commandments, in other words, a life of righteousness, is indispensable to admission into heaven, we must quote a great proportion of his instructions indeed, including the entire burthen of the whole. More, surely, cannot be necessary, to remind Christian readers of the constant tenor of his exhortations, than to repeat the sublime and pathetic conclusion of the longest of his discourses, his sermon on the mount. That whole discourse is a series of precepts enjoining righteousness of life; and he closes it with saying, "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him

\* John i. 17, 12.

† Ch. xiv. 21.



to a wise man which built his house upon a rock: and the rain descended and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not; because it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand: and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it.”\* So, how plainly are the conditions of admission to eternal happiness laid before us in the parable of the sheep and the goats! To the sheep, with words of the highest tenderness and affection, the Divine Judge enumerates a number of good works, as representative of a life of charity and goodness, which he says they had done, and done to him: and these are expressly denominated the righteous: to the goats the same works are mentioned as having by them been entirely neglected: and the discourse concludes with saying, “And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.”† And the doctrine of the Epistles is precisely the same as that of the Gospels, though much mischievous industry has been employed to set them at variance; and many theologians of high name have thought they have effected a glorious achievement, when they have made the Apostles appear to contradict their Divine Master, and when they have extolled the sentiments thus forced from their epistles as the genuine gospel, and depreciated the opposite sentiments of Jesus Christ as not “evangelical.”‡ Paul, however, plainly enough teaches, that it is righteousness of life which enables man to stand in the judgment, and to obtain admission into heaven. “God,” he declares “will render to every man according to his deeds: To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality,—eternal life: But unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath: tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil;—but glory, honor, and

\* Matt. vii. 24 to 27.

† Matt. xxv. 34 to 46.

‡ See a Sermon of Nathan Taylor, an old divine, in the Methodist Magazine for July or August, 1823. Toplady, in his posthumous tracts, quotes the words of Paul in Acts xiii. 39 as the doctrine of the gospel, in opposition to the words of Jesus in Matt. v. 48, which he treats as the abrogated doctrine of the law. It would be easy to multiply examples.

peace, to every man that worketh good.”\* So the same apostle assures us, that to produce this life of obedience is the design of the grace of God: “The grace of God,” saith he, “that bringeth salvation, hath appeared unto all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God, even our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.”† Here the apostle plainly tells us, that the grace of God, of which he elsewhere speaks so often, is given to enable us to live righteously; that it is by living righteously that we shall be prepared to stand before our Saviour and Judge; and that the design of his coming into the world, whence we receive such grace, also was, to enable us so to live, by being zealous of good works.

This then is the doctrine of the New Church respecting the way of admission into heaven: and this we see, according to the Scriptures throughout, is the only way thither. A good life, or a life of righteousness, seriously commenced in this world, is the only life that can endure the sphere of heaven, and the presence of the Divine Judge. On this account, a life according to the ten commandments is one of the two essentials to which the doctrines of the New Church reduce the whole of religion: the other is the acknowledgment of the Lord. And these two are completely incapable of being separated in act, though they may be thought of separately in idea. For no one can live a life of obedience to the commandments, from an internal ground, as well as in outward form from himself: it is only possible by and from the Lord, and by power communicated from him; let none therefore suppose, that, when insisting upon a life of righteousness, we go about to establish our own righteousness. It being only possible by power communicated from the Lord, all the merit of it belongs, not to man, but to the Lord alone. And this power can be imparted to none but those who acknowledge the Lord, and look to him to impart it. In like manner, no one in heart acknowledges the Lord, but in proportion as he is in the desire of

\* Rom. ii. 6 to 10.

† Tit. ii. 11 to 14.

obeying his commandments; without which, whatever he may say with the lips, he is in the denial of the Lord in his heart, whether he may be aware of it or not; and the loudest profession of faith is but an empty sound. Faith and life invariably go together, and such as the one is, such is the other.

Such being the fact, and such the doctrine of the New Church on the absolute necessity of a life of righteousness,—most cordially does she accept the divine declaration which says, “Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.” What is the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees here spoken of, and rejected, by the Lord? Its character is abundantly delineated in other parts of the New Testament. It was the righteousness of those who formed the most strict professors of the church at that time existing in the world, but which was in a state of utter decline and corruption. It was a righteousness which was rigid in outward observances, especially in little matters, but which quite overlooked and disregarded the true end and design of the divine commandments, and, while it kept them in the letter, entirely omitted them in the spirit. It was a righteousness which did its works to be seen of men. It was a righteousness which made great pretensions to more religion than others, and which announced its claims by its outward appearance and the form of its dress; for we read, of the Scribes and Pharisees, that they made broad their phylacteries, and enlarged the borders of their garments. It was a righteousness which, in the language of the prophet, continually said in its heart, “Stand away, and come not near, for I am holier than thou;” and the professors of which, in the language of the gospel, “trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others.” It was a righteousness which made clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, while within they were full of extortion and excess. It was a righteousness which paid tithe of mint, and anise, and cummin, and omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith or fidelity. It was a righteousness which, not finding the precepts of the divine Word numerous and minute enough to give sufficient opportunity

for its love of display and pretence, added many others to it, about which the divine law is silent and indifferent; such as the washing of cups and pots, brazen vessels and tables, and of the hands before meat. In short, it was a righteousness which affected the external man, only, and did not reach within; a righteousness which delighted more in performances of its own invention, than in any that the law of God enjoined; and which, in the performance of the latter, even when it kept the moral law or that of the ten commandments, only kept it in external form, and merely as a civil and moral law—thus from outward motives, such as only looked to well-being in this world,—without regarding it at the same time as a spiritual law, whose precepts are to form the law of the mind as well as the law of the body.

What then is the righteousness which the Lord alluded to, when he declares that it is a righteousness which must exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees? Does he mean that we must be still more scrupulous than they in matters purely indifferent? Does he mean that, whatever they do, we must go further in the same line? that as they make sad their faces that they may appear unto men to fast, we must make ours sadder? that as they so arrange the form of their garments as to announce their pretensions to holiness to all beholders, we must still more distinguish ourselves by the singularity of our appearance? Nothing, surely, nothing of the kind. He does not mean that we are to exceed them in that in which they are superabundant, but in that in which they are deficient; by keeping the divine commandments in our hearts as well as in our actions; by supplying to the observance the inward principle, without which the outward form is an idle mockery, a dead letter. This is evident from the comment which the Divine Speaker makes upon his own text. The Scribes and Pharisees thought that they sufficiently obeyed the commandment which says, "Thou shalt not kill," if they did not carry their enmities into the outward act of murder: the Divine Author and Expositor of the commandment declares, that he is guilty of a breach of it, and liable to divine judgment accordingly, "who is angry with his brother without cause." The Scribes and Pharisees thought that they sufficiently obeyed the commandment which says, "Thou shalt not



commit adultery," if they did not carry the concupiscence into the very act: "But I say unto you," says the Divine Author and Expositor of the commandment, "That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her already in his heart."\* And from these two instances, the Saviour plainly intimates the extent of all the other precepts of the decalogue, and clearly shows in which direction the righteousness of his disciples must exceed that of those who acted in that day as the teachers of righteousness. He calls not upon us to be more sanctimonious than they were, but more sincere; not to shelter ourselves behind the mere letter of a precept, but to take in with it its whole spirit and design; and not to be content only to shun evils as they appear before the world, but so to shun them as to avoid them also in the sight of God.

~~THIS THEN~~ is the species of righteousness which the Lord Jesus Christ prescribes to his disciples, and without which he declares that they shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven: and this accordingly is the life which is insisted upon in the doctrines of the New Church. The ten commandments, those doctrines affirm, understood both naturally and spiritually, are the rule of life for Christians. Let any one who wishes to see this clearly proved, consult that work of Swedenborg's, which treats expressly and solely on this subject: it is called *The Doctrine of life for the New Jerusalem, from the Commandments of the Decalogue*. It consists of fourteen chapters, in which the same number of leading propositions is stated and proved; and as they are all most profoundly important, and shew in the strongest light what our doctrines are upon this truly vital subject, I will here repeat them. The first—the sentiment with which the work opens, and which it lays down as the fundamental of all, is one which ought to be written in letters of gold in every church and in every house, and, most indispensably, on every heart: It is, *That all Religion has relation to life; and that the life of Religion is to do good*. The next affirms, *That no one can do good which is really good from himself*. The third declares, *That so far as man shuns evils as sins, so far he does good, not from himself, but from the Lord*. The fourth states, *That so far*

\* Mat. v. 21 to 23.

as any one shuns evils as sins, so far he loves truths. The fifth pronounces, *That so far as any one shuns evils as sins, so far he has faith, and is a spiritual man.* The sixth observes, *That the Decalogue points out what evils are sins.* The seventh explains, *That murders, adulteries, thefts, and false witness, of every kind, are the evils which are to be shunned as sins.* The four next evince, *That so far as any one shuns these evils as sins, he is in the opposite good: thus that so far as any one thus shuns murder of every kind, he loves his neighbor; so far as any one thus shuns adultery, he loves chastity; so far as any one thus shuns theft, he loves honesty; and so far as any one thus shuns false witness, or lying, he loves truth.* The twelfth demonstrates, *That no one can shun evils as sins, so as to hold them in aversion, but by combating against them.* The thirteenth assures us, *That man ought to shun evils as sins, and to fight against them, so if he could do it from himself* (because the Lord is present with every one that strives, and gives him the power.) The fourteenth discloses, *That if any one shun evils from any other motive than because they are sins, he in reality does not shun them, but only prevents them from showing themselves before the world.*—This, my Candid Readers, is our doctrine on the life that leads to heaven: I appeal to you whether any doctrine can go more completely to the root of all evil. Is it not evident, that when this doctrine affirms respecting each of the evils prohibited in the Decalogue that every kind of such evil is to be shunned as sin, it goes to the full extent of the Lord's requirement, that the righteousness of his disciples should exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees? To shew what is meant by shunning all the kinds of each general evil, I will mention how this is explained in the chapter on the precept respecting shunning adultery. "By committing adultery, is meant," says the enlightened author, "in the sixth commandment of the Decalogue, in a natural sense, not only the external crime, but also all obscene practices, wanton discourse, and filthy thoughts: but, in a spiritual sense, by committing adultery is meant to adulterate the good things taught in the Word, and to falsify its truths: but in the supreme sense, by committing adultery is meant, to deny the Lord's Divinity, and to profane the Word:—And they are guilty of all these kinds of adultery together, who do not, both in faith and

life, hold adulteries to be sins." And, after shewing how diametrically opposite the uncleanness of adultery is to the chastity of marriage, he presently adds, "Hence it may plainly be concluded and seen, whether a man is a Christian or not,—yea, whether a man has any religion or not. He who does not, both in faith and life, hold adulteries as sins, is not a Christian, and has no religion. On the other hand, he who shuns adulteries as sins; and still more, he who on that account holds them in aversion; and still more, he who on that account abominates them; has religion, and is a Christian."—Does not this come up to the full doctrine of the Lord Jesus Christ? Is it not his doctrine in all its integrity and purity? And as all the other evils prohibited by the Decalogue are laid open in the same searching manner,—I will not say what a want of integrity,—but, what ignorance of the subject, is displayed by those, who can reproach the doctrine of the New Church for the "laxity of its precepts!" All the precepts or commandments of God they enforce in all their fulness: they are only indifferent about such precepts as are Pharisaical additions to the laws of God,—the mere commandments of men,—vain traditions, the tendency of which is, to withdraw attention from the commandments of God, and to make them of none effect.

I now close this Appeal; and to avoid protracting it further, I will make no additional attempt to recommend the subjects which have been considered to the favorable attention of you to whom it is addressed,—the Reflecting of all Denominations. I will only entreat you, as becomes men of reflection and thence of candor, to weigh what has been offered in the balance of a serious and impartial judgment, and under the influence of a real love of truth; and, in order that you may be guided aright in your decision, I would only earnestly beg of you to remember the request made in the introduction above (pp. 6, 7),—to put your minds for the occasion under the direction of HIM, who is the Truth itself, the Light of the world. Then, and then only, may you rely, that the Holy Spirit, which He sends from the Father, will guide you into all truth. The consequence, I trust, will be that you will be brought to the conviction, that the important Doctrines of Faith and Life which have now been presented to your consideration, are those which tend, above

all others, rightly to inform the understanding and to purify the heart; that the Views which have been offered respecting the Eternal World and State, are such as carry the highest evidence of their own reality, and impress the reality of the things belonging to that world and state in the strongest manner on the human mind; and that the opinions which have been advanced respecting the accomplishment of the Second Coming of the Lord and of the Last Judgment, with the raising up of a Human Instrument for making them known, are precisely what Prophecy, rightly understood, should lead mankind to expect; and what Experience and Fact,—the experience, in our day, of the whole world, and facts which press upon the observation of all,—irresistibly confirm. And even such of you as, not yet venturing to put your minds under the direction of the Lord Jesus Christ, but looking for light to some different source, shall not be convinced that these sentiments are true, must yet, I trust, be satisfied, that both our doctrines and ourselves have been greatly misrepresented, and are in general much misunderstood;—that our doctrines are not altogether undeserving of attention, and that those who hold them are not altogether deserving of contempt. As to what is thought of ourselves, however, we desire to be indifferent; but the sincerest charity compels us to wish, that mankind may be led to think less unworthily of what, we are satisfied, is the Truth. But this also, we are instructed, will, sooner or later, be the case. For though it is agreeable to divine prediction, that, at the time of the Second Coming, “they should make war with the Lamb,”—should oppose the belief of the Divinity of the Lord’s Humanity and of his oneness with the Father, with the other truths then to be made known; yet the same prediction assures us, that “the Lamb shall overcome them,”—shall convince them, from the Word, of their mistake: “for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings.”\* Happy, assuredly, are they, who yield to his dominion! Thus happy are they, by whatever denomination they wish to be called, who practically admit the two first essentials of the New Church, prefigured, as we believe, by the New Jerusalem; which are,—The acknowledgment of the Lord in understanding and in heart; and, A life according to his commandments.

\* Rev. xvii. 14.









DATE DUE

DEC 11 2000

FEB 15 2006

NOV 28 2005

NOV 23 2005



COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES



0043353819

938.94

I1668

